

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8705) granting an increase of pension to Kitty A. Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8706) granting a pension to Jemima A. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2415. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of American Civil Liberties Union, New York City, N. Y., favoring the immediate recognition by the United States of the Philippine Islands as an independent State; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

2416. Also (by request), petition of members and friends of the National Woman's Party meeting at national headquarters, Capitol Hill, Washington, D. C., requesting Congress to submit to the State legislatures for their approval the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2417. By Mr. BOYCE: Petition of the Consumers' League of Delaware, Wilmington, Del., favoring the adoption of proposed child labor amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2418. Also, petition of Sabbath School, First Central Presbyterian Church, Wilmington, Del., approving and indorsing the Permanent Court of International Justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2419. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition of the board of directors of the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce, approving the provisions of the national defense act, providing for a citizens' army, and for an appropriation by Congress of the sum of not less than \$6,000,000,000 to meet the requirements designated by the act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2420. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Thomson-Crooker Shoe Co., Boston, Mass., protesting against the passage of the shoe tag bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2421. Also, petition of Maritime Association of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass., recommending that the Newton bill, now pending, be modified so as to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission, upon complaint that adequate facilities are not afforded at any port or ports, to rescind the application of section 28 as to any such port or ports if the public interest and the advantage and convenience of the commerce of the people warrant such action; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2422. Also, petition of the Hillson Co., Boston, Mass., protesting against the proposed tax on mah jong games; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2423. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of the Detroit Council of Postal Associations, Detroit, Mich., favoring the Kelly-Edge bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2424. By Mr. MORTON D. HULL: Petition of citizens of the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, in behalf of Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2425. Also, petition of Chicago Lithuanians, opposing the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2426. By Mr. McSWEENEY: Papers to accompany House bill 7431, granting a pension to Raymond E. Fisher, late of Troop K, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry; to the Committee on Pensions.

2427. By Mr. SITES: Petition of Harrisburg Camp, No. 8, United Spanish War Veterans, Harrisburg, Pa., dated March 28, 1924, indorsing the proposed legislation to increase the pensions of veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, April 16, 1924

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 10, 1924)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Fletcher	McKellar
Bayard	Frazier	McKinley
Borah	George	McLean
Brandegee	Gerry	McNary
Broussard	Glass	Mayfield
Bruce	Gooding	Moses
Bursum	Hale	Neely
Cameron	Harrell	Norbeck
Capper	Harris	Norris
Caraway	Harrison	Oddie
Colt	Heflin	Overman
Copeland	Howell	Pepper
Cummins	Johnson, Minn.	Phlips
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman
Dale	Kendrick	Ralston
Dial	Keyes	Reed, Pa.
Edge	King	Robinson
Edwards	Ladd	Sheppard
Ernst	Lodge	Shields
Fernald	McCormick	Shipstead

Shortridge
Simmons
Smith
Smoot
Spencer
Stanfield
Stephens
Sterling
Swanson
Trammell
Underwood
Wadsworth
Walsh, Mass.
Walsh, Mont.
Warren
Weller
Willis

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] owing to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

I also wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] on account of illness in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

I was requested to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent in attendance upon hearings before a special investigating committee of the Senate.

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. GLASS. Will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, purely on the assumption that none of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber and none of the representative leaders of my party outside of the Chamber will want to be held responsible for the address which I ventured to make yesterday I want to correct a newspaper statement with reference to it.

I find in the New York Evening Post of yesterday, as well as in the Washington Star, a statement which has the caption:

GLASS berates President in bitter speech after conference with party chiefs. Address considered significant as representing planned minority move.

In the text of the article it is stated that—

it became known, as the Senator was speaking, that he had decided on the major points of his address after a conference with a group of influential men of his party, both in and out of Congress.

Mr. President, the only group that knew anything about my speech was the group of women stenographers employed in my office to whom the speech was dictated. Not a living human being on this side of the Chamber or out of the Chamber had notice of a word that I would utter until it was spoken.

#### INVESTIGATION OF INTERNAL REVENUE BUREAU

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Virginia made the statement he has just made, though it was quite needless, for I do not believe anyone who knows the Senator from Virginia would suppose he was making a "group" speech for anyone.

I dislike extremely to take any time which ought to be devoted to the business now before the Senate. I have tried to avoid making any speeches because it seems to me the first duty of the Senate is to dispose of the very important legislation now pending. The immigration bill which we have before us at this moment is a bill of the greatest possible importance to the people of the United States. It will have an effect upon the qualities of American citizenship in years to come when we all have passed away.

But, Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia made a speech yesterday criticizing, as he had an entire right to do, the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. I have no suggestion of fault to make with the manner of the speech, for the Senator from Virginia knows very well how to be severe and parliamentary at the same time. But it seems to me to be a speech of such importance that I do not think I can allow it to pass without any comment at all.

The Senator from Virginia is not one of those who ever for a moment mistakes lungs and language for a speech. His speeches

are always able, eloquent, show a great deal of thought, and are powerful presentations of his view of an important subject before the Senate in which he is interested. I am not given to meaningless compliments, which are so frequent in this body, but I not only have a great respect for the Senator from Virginia but I shall always recall, while I still hold a seat here, one speech he made on the settlement of the British debt which I can say without exaggeration, after a good many years of experience, was one of the most impressive and important speeches I have ever heard made in this body. Therefore all he said on the matter of the message which the President sent to the Senate and on the letter which accompanied it, written by the Secretary of the Treasury, is of moment.

I desire to comment upon and sustain the President's message to which the junior Senator from Virginia devoted a large part of his attention. I hold in my hand the message of the President of the United States to which he referred.

Mr. President, in the first place, I do not think there is any possible ground for attempting to find fault with the President because he communicates his views on a matter like the subject of this message directly to the Senate. Our history shows that Presidents have never hesitated under the authority given them by the Constitution to communicate to Congress or to give their views on many subjects, and especially on any which they have believed affected injuriously the administration of the Government. Anyone who is curious on this matter might refresh his memory by reading some of the Senate debates during the administration of Andrew Jackson, and especially those relating to what is known as the resolution of censure which was passed by the Senate and the subsequent resolution, when the Democrats had regained control of the Senate, to expunge the former resolution of censure. I may say there were some personalities in both instances, and the action taken by the Senate in passing both the resolution of censure and then the subsequent resolution to expunge the censure seems to me, as a mere question of history, to have been entirely futile.

Presidents have exercised a wide discretion on the subjects upon which they may communicate with the Senate. As recently as the administration of President Wilson, Mr. Wilson came here and addressed the Senate on the subject of a constitutional amendment in connection with which, under the Constitution, the President has no part. No fault was found with his doing so, and I see no reason to find any. The recent message of the President relates directly to the conduct of the public business, with which the President is charged as Chief Executive.

The President begins by stating that—

There exists, and always should exist, every possible comity between the executive departments and the Senate. Whatever may be necessary for the information of the Senate or any of its committees, in order better to enable them to perform their legislative or other constitutional functions, ought always to be furnished willingly and expeditiously by any department. The executive branch has nothing that it would wish to conceal from any legitimate inquiry on the part of the Senate. But it is recognized both by law and by custom that there is certain confidential information which it would be detrimental to the public service to reveal.

The right of the Executive to refuse to send documents, papers, or other information to the Senate if he regards sending them as incompatible with the public interest is an authority which the Executive must exercise; he must have that power in all completeness. There are many things in his charge which it would be detrimental to the public interest to publish. In every resolution that passes the Senate, which is addressed to the President, and which relates to foreign affairs, I think, the clause "if not incompatible with the public interest" is always inserted. In fact, I think there is no question as to the authority of the Executive over papers and information in any department of the Government which are in his charge and which must be in his charge. The President in his message continues:

Such information as can be disclosed I shall always unhesitatingly direct to be laid before the Senate. I recognize also that it is perfectly legitimate for the Senate to indulge in political discussion and partisan criticism.

But the attack which is being made on the Treasury Department goes beyond any of these legitimate requirements.

Certainly if there is anything under our system of government which should be within the direct control of the Executive, so far as correspondence and information go, it should be the Treasury Department. We have laws providing for holding private certain papers and documents relating to taxes which are under the jurisdiction of the Treasury. Whether that is

wise, as a general law, is a question which Congress can decide, but that it is the law to-day is beyond doubt.

After stating—

But the attack which is being made on the Treasury Department goes beyond any of these legitimate requirements—

The President then states—

Seemingly the request for a list of the companies in which the Secretary of the Treasury was alleged to be interested, for the purpose of investigating their tax returns, must have been dictated by some other motive than a desire to secure information for the purpose of legislation.

I think there can be no question in the mind of anybody that the purpose of that request could not have been otherwise than to inquire into the character of the Secretary of the Treasury himself. The President then continues:

The Senate resolution appointing this committee is not drawn in terms which purport to give any authority to the committee to delegate their authority or to employ agents and attorneys.

I believe that is undoubtedly true.

The appointment of an agent and attorney to act in behalf of the United States but to be paid by some other source than the Public Treasury is in conflict with the spirit of section 1764 of the Revised Statutes, the act of March 3, 1917.

The constitutional and legal rights of the Senate ought to be maintained at all times. Also the same must be said of the executive departments. But these rights ought not to be used as a subterfuge to cover unwarranted intrusion. It is the duty of the Executive to resist such intrusion and to bring to the attention of the Senate its serious consequences.

Mr. President, I think it was well within the province of the President to call attention to what he regards and what many people regard as going beyond the legitimate rights of the Senate itself. I have always during my service here supported to the best of my ability the rights and prerogatives of the Senate; I think I have often been considered rather a stickler on that point; I certainly have been criticized for my attitude at times when we had a President of a different party; but I have also always believed that the rights of the other branches of the Government should be equally observed and that we who stand for our own rights very vigorously, as we should, should be extremely careful not to invade the rights of the other two departments of the Government, either the executive or the judicial. That division of powers and that observance of rights applies to all the departments of the Government equally, and I think in this particular case, as to the committee to which the President refers, the proposition of the subcommittee went clearly beyond the rights of the Senate.

Mr. President, in regard to the point that was especially made concerning the employment of counsel to be paid by an individual Senator, which action was approved by the subcommittee, there is this to be considered: Wholly apart from the statute, it has never been the practice here, to my knowledge, for any committee to employ attorneys—which is, I think, very rarely done—or other outside assistance without a direct order from the Senate itself. The committee is a creature of the Senate; it is made by the Senate and intended to represent the Senate, and therefore all power for the expenditure of money by a committee must come through the Senate. That is recognized in every resolution which we adopt authorizing an inquiry. Having an attorney paid by an individual member and not responsible to the committee, again apart from the statute, seems to me an impossible policy for any great legislative body to adopt.

I can not believe that it is the intention of the full committee or of the Senate to allow any such step to be taken. In fact, under the resolution as it passed, there is no such authority given by the Senate. That is a question which must be decided. It is not necessary at this time to go over the points that may be raised under the statute. I think the statute against payment by outsiders would cover any "Government employee," which is a very broad term. If strictly enforced, it would no doubt, in my judgment, prevent Senators from hiring or engaging persons to help them in their offices.

To take another example, I can not see how we have a right to provide that men doing overtime work, either in the night inspection of immigrants or in the inspection and examination of goods in vessels arriving at night, shall be paid directly or indirectly by the vessels requiring those overtime services. I introduced myself, without giving proper attention to the act—indeed, without recalling it—a bill to give overtime pay to customhouse inspectors. They ought to have it. They are miserably underpaid now, and so are the immigration inspectors;

But if this law is to be enforced with the utmost rigidity it will have to be modified. The same is true, I should think, of the traffic police in the city of Washington, whom year after year Congress has permitted to be paid by the railroad companies in order that we may have traffic policemen, especially at the crossings. Even those cases require modification of the law if it is to be rigidly enforced, and it ought to be modified in those certain directions; but, Mr. President, this case is one that it seems to me no modification ought to cover. There can be no doubt that an attorney employed in an investigation by a committee of the Senate represents the Senate itself to that extent; and, whatever we do, the proposition of the subcommittee ought not to be concurred in.

To that the President called attention, and the Secretary of the Treasury still more sharply. When the President, then, referred to intrusion, he referred, of course, to bringing in an outsider, and apparently giving him the right to make public certain papers, not only in disregard of the law on the subject, but apparently relieving him from that law by resolution of the Senate alone, which I do not think can be done. There are many papers, some covered by law, some not, which it would be utterly impossible and wrong for the Executive to send in for publication in the newspapers of the United States, for that is what it amounts to.

The President says:

Under a procedure of this kind the constitutional guaranty against unwarranted search and seizure breaks down, the prohibition against what amounts to a Government charge of criminal action without the formal presentment of a grand jury is evaded, the rules of evidence which have been adopted for the protection of the innocent are ignored, the department becomes the victim of vague, unformulated, and indefinite charges, and instead of a government of law we have a government of lawlessness. Against the continuation of such a condition I enter my solemn protest, and give notice that in my opinion the departments ought not to be required to participate in it. If it is to continue, if the Government is to be thrown into disorder by it, the responsibility for it must rest on those who are undertaking it. It is that we returned to a government under and in accordance with the usual forms of the law of the land. The state of the Union requires the immediate adoption of such a course.

That is strongly stated, but it is in defense of the undoubted Executive rights, and it merits my full concurrence. I do not see how it can be distorted into an insult or even an incivility to the Senate. The Senate has been extending in various directions its activities or, certainly, its practices. In the language of the newspapers it has created a new office, which is called "the committee prosecutor." Being the high court of impeachment before which the House of Representatives alone can appear as bringing the impeachment, it has sent to the House a resolution—which, constitutionally, I suppose, it had an entire right to do—in which, substantially, it invites the House to impeach a given person—a collector of customs, I believe, somewhere on the border in Texas—and then, if the House impeaches that person, the court which has sent the resolution to the House is going to try the accused—a mere mockery of justice. It may be all constitutional. I did not oppose it. I thought it was just as well to let it get through, because no one was disposed to hinder investigations, and also because I felt a reasonable assurance, without knowing anything about it, that the House of Representatives were not devoid of a sense of humor, and that we should never hear any more of the solemn resolution of the Senate.

We have now undertaken in a subcommittee to permit the payment of attorneys who represent the Senate itself by an individual Senator. It might just as well be by an outsider. Against those things the President of the United States has protested. He has protested in vigorous language. He has protested because he feels strongly about what he regards, rightly or wrongly, as an invasion of Executive rights. He has stated a complete recognition of the rights of the Senate, but he has condemned the procedure by which those rights are being exercised in the Senate, and I think he was entirely justified in doing so.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. Does the Senator from Massachusetts justify the interpretation placed upon the President's message and the purpose attributed to it by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, that is something I do not undertake to answer. I was not here when the speech was delivered, and I know nothing about it.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator, of course, has read it?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I have read such portions as appeared in the newspapers.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Indiana stated to the Senate that he had conferred with the President, and expressed the conclusion that there is an intention to investigate the prohibition unit in the Internal Revenue Bureau, and that that fact is the occasion for criticism of the Senate's course and the course of the committee of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, of that I know nothing. I am not fond of nor do I give weight to hearsay evidence, which has been very popular in the Senate for some time. I am taking what the President said and for which he is responsible, not what somebody else said he said.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator be kind enough to yield to another question or two?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has placed what appears to me and what I believe appears to the press of the country to be a very narrow construction upon the President's message, and consequently has given a narrow application to it. He has indicated that it is confined solely to criticism of the arrangement for the employment of Mr. Heney, and to objections to the alleged purpose of the committee to require the publication of confidential records in the Department of the Treasury. Does not the Senator think that, considering the message as a whole, it is an expression of resentment toward the general policy of the Senate as revealed in the investigations now in progress under the order of the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. I do not so read it. I think it is perfectly clear what he is objecting to.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the objection is to the employment of an attorney by an individual member of the Senate committee, it is perfectly clear that if it is desirable that the committee be authorized to employ attorneys, that action can be taken very promptly by the Senate. Does the Senator from Massachusetts favor supporting the resolution of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] and its passage through the Senate—the resolution authorizing the committee to employ counsel and experts?

Mr. LODGE. I think if proper limitations are put on the employment I shall be in favor of it.

Mr. ROBINSON. What limitations would the Senator suggest?

Mr. LODGE. That no one shall be allowed to name an attorney except the committee, and that no money shall be paid except by the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the committee should be authorized to make the employment, it would follow as a matter of course that the employment must be by the committee, would it not?

Mr. LODGE. By the committee, subject to the approval of the Senate. I should wish to put that in.

Mr. ROBINSON. Was that course ever taken before in authorizing a committee of the Senate to employ counsel?

Mr. LODGE. I dare say not; but a great many things have been done at this session that never have happened before.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator, then, is in favor of an unusual and extraordinary course in authorizing the employment of this counsel? He would make the attorney the employee of the Senate rather than of the committee?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I think it would be an improvement.

Mr. ROBINSON. What is the occasion for the extraordinary course that the Senator suggests?

Mr. LODGE. In order to get a proper investigation.

Mr. ROBINSON. Does not the Senator think that the Senate committee can do that?

Mr. LODGE. Not if it is going to employ Mr. Heney.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator's objection, then, is to Mr. Heney?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; but there may be other Mr. Heney's. I do not know.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator is unwilling to have the committee exercise its discretion in the selection of an attorney except upon the condition he has named?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I am, under the existing situation.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator knows that a very distinguished public man, Governor Pinchot, suggested the selection of Mr. Heney, and that Governor Pinchot is the governor of the State from which Mr. Mellon comes, or in which Mr. Mellon lives.

Mr. LODGE. I do not see that that has any bearing upon it. I object just as much to Governor Pinchot directing our committees as I do to the payment of their counsel by a single Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has no more objection to Governor Pinchot making a suggestion to the committee than to the President doing so, has he?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think anybody has suggested anyone to the committee except the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Couzens]. It is not usual for the Senate to select Government counsel. I have never seen it done here before; but we provided that we should select Government counsel to try the most important case involved in the resolution first presented by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Walsh].

I was entirely in accord with that. I think it was well that the Senate should take part in the selection of those counsel. I think it has reached the point in this committee where the assent of the Senate will be equally valuable to the proper conduct of the inquiry.

Mr. President, I want to say a single word—and I shall be very brief—in regard to the letter which was transmitted by the President, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury himself. I do not think, and I did not mean to suggest that I thought, that the President's message was confined at all to the matter of the appointment of Mr. Heney. That was but one detail. I thought that what the President was particularly aiming at was this attempt of the Senate to enter into general charge of the papers of an important unit of the Treasury Department without regard to the statute law, or to the practice of the Senate and of the Executive in relation to papers.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator be kind enough to yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield again to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LODGE. I will. I should like to get through, but I will yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator has any impatience about the matter, I will not press my questions at this time.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator knows, of course, that the special committee had not requested that any papers in the Treasury Department be submitted to it to which the Secretary had raised the slightest objection. The Senator knows that; and that the only papers which the committee had requested that it be permitted to investigate are papers which the public are entitled to see under the law. In other words, the committee had not sought, either expressly or impliedly, to procure possession of any records, or to get the right to examine any records, which under the law are withheld from publicity.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator knows perfectly well that the Secretary of the Treasury waived all rights he had, or might have had, and all objections to the investigation of papers—

Mr. ROBINSON. If he did that, why should the President of the United States—

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator let me finish my sentence? I at least ought to have the floor for that.

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. He waived any objection that could be made to the production of all returns relating to any corporation in which he had any personal interest. Those were asked for by the committee, I think.

Mr. ROBINSON. Since he did make the waiver, how can the President complain that the committee has acted improperly? It was within the province of the Secretary to refuse the waiver, in which event the committee could not have seen the papers; but since he did waive the privacy, I can not comprehend how the President finds it a circumstance which justifies him in criticizing the course of the Senate and refers to it as a lawless procedure. It was for the Secretary himself to determine whether he would waive privacy respecting the tax returns, and prior to the time when he was requested to do so by the special committee of the Senate, he had on his own motion expressed a purpose to do so, and had requested that the Senate committee take the course which it subsequently took. When the Senate committee acted upon the suggestion of Mr. Mellon and proceeded to investigate his private tax returns and the tax returns of the companies in which he was interested, it did so at his suggestion and request, and there was not the slightest occasion, according to my humble opinion, for the President either to feel or express resentment toward the Senate for its course and characterize it as having promoted lawless government.

Mr. LODGE. There is only one Secretary of the Treasury who could be affected and who was asked, and he made the waiver. The President, I take it, is undertaking to protect the

great body of innocent people, who have no political value in an inquiry, from having all their private business dragged out in a committee investigation on the chance of finding something.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me—

Mr. ROBINSON. Just a moment, with the Senator's permission. The Senator from Massachusetts, of course, knows that it has been stated repeatedly in the Senate, and has never been questioned, that it was the purpose of the committee to hold confidential the information which it obtained, unless some consideration sounding in the public interest required publicity; so that there was not the slightest danger of any stockholder in a Mellon company being injured or prejudiced by the action of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator knows that when such things are discussed in a committee they get out.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, I know he does not want to labor under a misapprehension—

Mr. LODGE. I am laboring under no misapprehension.

Mr. SWANSON. I think the Senator is—

Mr. LODGE. If I have misstated a fact, I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. SWANSON. The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson] stated—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I can save my time and the Senate's. I am not going to discuss the speech of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. SWANSON. I am not discussing his speech.

Mr. LODGE. It is not relevant, and I am not going to discuss it.

Mr. SWANSON. This is a statement of fact.

Mr. LODGE. I decline to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts declines to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to complete what I have to say about Mr. Mellon. I am not here to discuss the Senator from Indiana or his speech. He can do that himself, and do it very well.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the junior Senator from Virginia?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GLASS. I have no disposition in the world to interrupt the Senator or to divert him from his line of argument; but it just occurs to me to point out to him, if I may in a moment, that the President could very easily and quickly have met the precise situation by calling attention to the fact that under the law no tax return in the Treasury may be examined without the consent of the President himself. So that there was no possibility of the committee, in the circumstances, dragging out any private papers in the Treasury.

Mr. LODGE. It appeared to me from what I read of the proceedings of the committee that that was precisely what they were intending to do. That was the whole point of their investigation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LODGE. I yield for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I just wanted to ask the Senator if this language of the Secretary himself about it would not preclude further statement on the part of the President. Mr. Mellon said:

I feel, however, that it is due to me and to the companies involved that your committee make immediate investigation in order that you may thoroughly satisfy yourselves and the public whether or not these companies have received any favors at the hands of the Government.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Treasury knew perfectly well that the whole investigation under that committee was directed against him, and, like an honest man, he proceeded to answer it at once. This whole investigation is aimed at Mr. Mellon, and I am about to say something in regard to him and his conduct of the department.

In my judgment he has been treated by that committee in a way which, if it had been applied to my friend the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Glass], who was an admirable Secretary of the Treasury, whose integrity was never questioned, who did the very best he could or that any man could do in a difficult situation—if he had been subjected to this, I think I know his temperament well enough to know that he would have resented it in language which everybody would have remembered.

This investigation is aimed at Mr. Mellon, not merely because he happens to be a Republican and the Secretary of the Treasury, but because he is the principal figure in the work of framing a great bill aimed to reduce the taxes of this country, a

bill in which the whole country is interested. Some of us believe in the bill as he framed it, many do not, and there are honest differences of opinion; but this investigation has assumed the position of an attempt to break him down, and there is much more behind it than mere politics, in my judgment.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts certainly does not mean to imply that any comment which I have made was intended to break down any tax plan?

Mr. LODGE. I am absolutely certain there was no such intention. I listened to every word the Senator said. He made a very able speech, as I have already said, and I am perfectly certain that nothing of that sort was in his mind.

On account of the conduct of this committee, and because of the kind of questions that have been asked, Mr. Mellon naturally feels the irritation and resentment that an honest man should feel. Mr. Mellon has occupied this great post, and has been an admirable Secretary of the Treasury. The proof is in something much more significant than anything brought out by an investigating committee can possibly be.

When Mr. Mellon came into office, on the 4th of March, 1921, the Liberty 3½'s were selling for \$90.92.

Liberty first 4's	\$87.22
Liberty second 4's	87.00
Liberty first converted 4½'s	87.22
Liberty second converted 4½'s	87.04
Liberty third converted 4½'s	90.26
Liberty third converted 4½'s registered	90.12
Liberty fourth 4½'s	87.18

I will now read in the same order the prices at which they are selling to-day.

Liberty 3½'s are selling for \$99.03, an advance of 9 points. Liberty first 4's have gone from \$87.22 to \$99.25. Liberty second 4's have gone from \$87 to \$99.23. Liberty first 4's have gone from \$87.22 to \$99.27. Liberty third 4½'s have gone from \$90.26 to par and 0.04. Liberty third 4½'s have gone from \$90.12 to par and 0.02. Liberty fourth 4½'s have gone from \$87.18 to \$99.29.

Mr. President, I do not for a moment say that that great rise in the securities of the United States was owing solely to Mr. Mellon, but I do say, and it can not be contradicted, that there never would have been such a rise in our securities if the people had not trusted the man at the head of the Treasury, and had not known that his general policies were sound and wise, and that he was working for the interests of the finances of the United States.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. I not only agree with that statement, but I go further and say that had not the people of the United States trusted the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States the securities of the Nation would have gone even lower than the first quotation made by the Senator from Massachusetts. But does the Senator from Massachusetts think he is exactly fair in not further indicating that there has been a period of more than three years in which private investors in the country have had an opportunity to absorb those securities, and does not the Senator know that in that very process itself the securities were obliged to rise in value?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes; I thought I had stated clearly that I did not attribute this all to Mr. Mellon. What I did say was that there would not have been that rise if he had been a Secretary of the Treasury in whom the country did not have confidence.

Mr. GLASS. Why, of course that is so.

Mr. LODGE. I was going to say another word in regard to that when the Senator interrupted me. I was on the committee which authorized these bond issues, and when we came to the later bond issues, of course we consulted with the Secretary of the Treasury—Mr. McAdoo at that time—as we did on all of them. As members of that committee who are here now remember, there was a question as to the rate. The Secretary of the Treasury believed that the bonds could be sold successfully at par, owing to the excitement and patriotism of the country, then greatly aroused. In that judgment events showed he was perfectly right. I thought at the time that he was right on that point, but I differed with him as to the rate, because I felt sure that after the excitement of war had subsided those securities were sure to reach a much lower market level, to the distress of small holders. It seemed to me at the time—perhaps I was wrong—that it would have been better to have made a higher rate and prevented the shrinkage which afterwards took place, for which the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, was in no wise responsible, nor was anyone else. It was simply the natural effect of cer-

tain economic forces, and the Senator from Virginia has just alluded to some of them.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I ask the Senator to yield for a question that is not intended to interfere with the Senator's argument, but intended possibly to throw a little light upon the advance in the price of the Federal securities.

When the refunding of the British debt was arranged for, I believe it was a part of the contract that the Federal Treasury should accept at par, when presented by the British Government, any American Government securities. They were at that time, I believe, selling quite a bit below par.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no. I will say to the Senator that those bonds were at par at the time the settlement was made. The Senator from Minnesota said they were greatly below par, but at that time, I think, the bonds were slightly higher than they are to-day.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I want also to call attention to the revenue act of 1921 which made Federal securities tax exempt when held by corporations. I believe Mr. Mellon stated in his letter to Mr. GREEN, which is made a part of his annual report for last year, that a tax-exempt security yielding 5 per cent was as good as a taxable security yielding 11 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. Provided the income of the individual holding the tax-exempt security ran into the highest brackets of the income tax law.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes. I simply wanted to point out to the Senator the fact that on account of that provision of the revenue act of 1921 it has evidently had a great deal to do with the rise in price of Federal securities.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, Mr. President, the great rise had taken place long before that. If the Senator will look over the figures he will find that to be the fact. The rise began much before March 4, 1921.

The public debt on August 31, 1919, reached its peak, higher than it was in 1918, because there were a great many outstanding debts and obligations that had to be met. It went up to \$28,594,000,000. On February 28, 1921, it had come down to \$24,049,527,000. On March 31, 1924, it had come down to \$21,623,777,000, a reduction in the three years since Mr. Mellon has been in the Treasury of \$2,425,000,000 of the debt.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I would like to inquire the opinion of the Senator as to the advisability of such an enormous reduction in the public debt in the very short period of time to which the Senator refers. Would it not have been much better for the people of the country to have had their taxes lowered than to continue to pay such a high rate of taxation, but reduce the debt?

Mr. LODGE. That is a very large question of financial policy. I think the policy suggested by the Senator from New Mexico would be a mistake, but I do not care to discuss that large question of financial policy at this time.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. The Senator has, of course unwittingly, failed to state that there had been a reduction of more than \$1,500,000,000 in the public indebtedness between the years 1919 and 1921.

Mr. LODGE. I stated that. I did not give the figures, but I stated the fact. I have the figures here. I did not mean to overlook the figures.

Mr. GLASS. The Senator did not make the fact known and indicate just what was the reduction. But what I rose particularly to say was that the law itself provides a stated sinking fund, and had Mr. Mellon been dead and had the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts occupied the post of Secretary of the Treasury the same reduction of public indebtedness would have taken place.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; if there had been the same reductions made in other directions. Those were not the only reductions.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts again yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LODGE. Not at this moment. I want to reply first to the Senator from Virginia. I gave the public debt at the peak as \$26,000,000,000. I gave it as of February 28, 1921, the figures showing a reduction of about \$2,500,000,000. I

then gave the reduction in 1924, which was \$2,500,000,000 more. I omitted to state—and I ought to have stated—that in round numbers the total reduction since the peak of 1919 was about \$5,000,000,000, which had been taken from the indebtedness; and, of course, part of that was when the Senator from Virginia himself and, I think, Mr. Houston were at the head of the Treasury.

It is not necessary now, because I am not making a financial speech, to go into the sources of those reductions. They were not all from one source. The Senator knows that better than I do. Some were from reductions in expenses. Others were from great sales of Government property which had to be disposed of. In the period of time before the Republican administration came in on March 4, 1921, half of the great reduction of \$5,000,000,000 had been made. But the whole point is not to argue the merits of one financial policy or another, but simply to say, and I believe the Senator from West Virginia will agree with me in this—

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, that is the second time the Senator has mislocated me. I am from Virginia.

Mr. LODGE. I mean the junior Senator. That is a fact of which I ought to be well aware. I know of course who the senior Senator from Virginia is.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico and Mr. NEELY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LODGE. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. I should like to say that the Senator from West Virginia is very glad the Senator from Massachusetts complimented the distinguished Senator from Virginia by locating him in our State.

Mr. LODGE. I did not know I did as badly as that. I thought I made the mistake of not calling him the junior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator now yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator has doubtless observed the total reduction of the debt of the United States last year was \$1,072,000,000. Does the Senator from Massachusetts believe that it was a wise policy to have continued the high tax rate of the people so as to reduce the debt by that amount?

Mr. LODGE. What does the Senator mean? To what debt does the Senator refer?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I refer to the debt of the United States, to which the Senator from Massachusetts has just been adverting. The debt was reduced last year.

Mr. LODGE. I think it was reduced by \$1,072,000,000.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes; \$1,072,000,000. I should like to inquire of the Senator if he believes it is a wise policy to make such an enormous reduction in the permanent debt of the United States in one year?

Mr. LODGE. We are engaged in trying to reduce taxes in view of the surplus which has been attained.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Does not the Senator believe it should have been done prior to this time?

Mr. LODGE. I believe in the very old-fashioned doctrine that there is no wealth in debts, and that the best way is to pay them as soon as it can be conveniently and safely done.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think there is anyone in the country who realized that the business of the country would increase as it did and enable us to collect the amount of money under the existing law that was collected. Senators will remember the amount that was given as the estimate of receipts during the year 1922. The amount collected has exceeded every estimate in every case, beginning with the amount estimated to be collected by the tariff down through every section of the revenue law. As the Senator from Massachusetts has said, we would have had a bill passed to reduce the taxes for the year 1923 to the extent of 25 per cent, but it failed of enactment before March 15. However, the Senator knows that such a provision is incorporated in the revenue bill that has just been reported to the Senate.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I would like to make this observation about what the Senator from Utah has just said.

Mr. LODGE. I shall be through in a very few moments, and then I will yield the floor to the Senator permanently.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have no desire to ask the Senator to yield the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have mentioned these facts simply to show that the administration of the Treasury Department by Mr. Mellon has been eminently wise and eminently successful. He feels that the character of the investigation now proposed to be carried on not only reflects on him, as it was intended to do when it was started, but that it is bringing about a situation which will be very deleterious to the transaction of public business in the Treasury, although he would be a better judge of that than I.

I can quite conceive, however, that the business of that great department would be most prejudicially affected, and thereby the business of the country would be injured if we unchained a criminal lawyer and turned him loose in that department with power to look into the affairs of rich and poor, guilty, if there be any guilty, and innocent alike. I can quite understand that men who are working in that great force of 60,000 employees will work less if they think they have a spy at their shoulders all the time. The great bulk of them are honest men, doing their duty honestly. I can quite see the President's point. Against that he makes a protest, and I am glad he has made the protest, for it involves not Mr. Mellon alone but, in my opinion, it involves the future of the tax bill and also a continuance of a sound administration of the Treasury.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. McKELLAR, and Mr. BRUCE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me in order that I may make a request for unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas for the purpose he has stated.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next at 2 o'clock the unfinished business then before the Senate, if any, be temporarily laid aside, and that if in the meantime the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate shall not have reported upon the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] authorizing the special committee charged with the investigation of the Bureau of Internal Revenue to employ counsel, experts, and accountants, the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution and that the Senate proceed to vote upon the resolution and all amendments which may be submitted to it.

Mr. BRUCE. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me in order that I may state the reason for my objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. Some of the rest of us would like to express our opinion in reference to the question which has just been under discussion. Indeed, there are some of us who think we should do so. I simply make this statement in order that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] may understand that I had a good reason for making the objection which I did.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me in order that I may make a statement with reference to what has just been stated?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee for the purpose he has indicated.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senate that, so far as two of the members of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate are concerned, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and myself have made very active efforts to secure a meeting of the committee and to have the resolution referred to by the Senator from Arkansas—the Jones resolution—reported favorably, but the chairman of the committee has declined to call a meeting, or at least he has not done so, and wishes the matter postponed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House further insisted on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 47 to the bill (H. R. 5078) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the

two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. CARTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) for the relief of the drought-stricken farm areas of New Mexico, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had adopted a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) providing that the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, in signing the enrolled bill (H. R. 6815) to authorize a temporary increase of the Coast Guard for law enforcement, be rescinded and that the said bill be reenrolled with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 655) to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. KEYES presented a petition of sundry citizens of Walpole, N. H., praying for the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LADD presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Niagara-Shawnee Agriculture Club at Niagara, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the so-called McNary-Haugen export corporation bill in its original form, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CAPPER presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the Molly Foster Berry Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Fort Scott, Kans., praying for the passage of the so-called Johnson restrictive immigration bill, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. FLETCHER presented petitions, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Miami and vicinity, in the State of Florida, praying for the passage of the so-called Johnson restrictive immigration bill, with quotas based on the 1890 census, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WILLIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Akron, Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Johnson immigration bill, with a 2 per cent restriction and quotas based on the 1890 census, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of James Grooves and sundry other citizens of Salem, of 450 members of the Central Methodist Episcopal Church, and of 400 members of the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, of Columbus, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of restrictive immigration legislation, with quotas based on the 1890 census, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CAMERON. I present a letter from Charles S. Taylor, department adjutant-treasurer, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, of Tucson, Ariz., transmitting certain resolutions adopted at the recent convention of the Department of Arizona, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF ARIZONA,  
DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR,  
Tucson, Ariz., April 10, 1924.

HON. RALPH CAMERON,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I beg to inclose copies of resolutions Nos. 5, 7, and 16, passed and adopted by the Department of Arizona, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, in convention assembled at Tucson, Ariz., April 1, 2, and 3, 1924.

I am especially asked to call your attention to resolution No. 5 and to request your careful consideration of the matters therein contained.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES S. TAYLOR,  
Department Adjutant-Treasurer.

Resolution 5, requesting that the United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 51, Tucson, Ariz., be made a permanent hospital, and that necessary improvements be authorized.

Whereas an official of the United States Veterans' Bureau has recommended that the United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 51, Tucson, Ariz., be made a permanent hospital; and

Whereas the climate along the coast of the twelfth district is too damp for a certain class of tuberculosis patients, and the altitude at Whipple Barracks is too high for another class of tuberculosis patients; and

Whereas United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 51 is located at an altitude that is neither too high nor too low for any class of tuberculosis patients; and

Whereas this hospital is located in an ideal dry climate, especially favorable to the treatment of tuberculosis of all types; and

Whereas there is a special need for an institution of this class in the twelfth district, so that tubercular veterans needing this special care and treatment can obtain it under favorable conditions and proper supervision without being sent to far-distant hospitals, where they would be kept separated from their families and those who are near and dear to them; and

Whereas the present type of wooden shacks and buildings are hot in summer and cold in winter, poorly equipped, and otherwise unsuited to the proper care of tubercular veterans: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, that the Department of Arizona, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, in convention assembled, Request the United States Veterans' Bureau to take immediate steps to make the United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 51 a permanent hospital, and have modern permanent buildings erected, and make other necessary improvements; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be mailed to each Congressman and Senator from the said twelfth district.

Passed and adopted at Tucson, Ariz., April 1, 1924.

Resolution 7, requesting amendment of war risk insurance act to include men who were disabled in service between April 6, 1917, and enactment of war risk insurance act, on November 6, 1917.

Whereas there are many men who were discharged from the service after April 6, 1917, on account of disabilities incurred in the service, who did not have an opportunity to apply for insurance under the war risk insurance act, which was passed at a later date; and

Whereas these men should be entitled to the same insurance benefits as other men who were disabled in the service of their country during the World War: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Department of Arizona Disabled American Veterans of the World War, in convention assembled at Tucson, Ariz., April 1, 2, and 3, respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to amend the war risk insurance act so that any person who served in the active military service after April 6, 1917, and who was discharged from service because of disabilities incurred in the service prior to the enactment of the war risk insurance act on October 6, 1917, shall be deemed to have made legal application for, and shall be entitled to receive, all insurance benefits of the war risk insurance act as amended.

Passed and adopted at Tucson, Ariz., April 2, 1924.

Resolution 16, being a resolution concerning the retention of nontuberculosis patients at United States Veterans' Hospital No. 51, at Tucson, Ariz.

Whereas the Veterans' Bureau has announced its intention to transfer all nontuberculosis patients from the United States Veterans' Hospital No. 51, at Tucson, Ariz.; and

Whereas a certain class of men who are suffering from bronchitis, asthma, and other respiratory diseases have found that the climate in this vicinity has proven very beneficial to them, and that they have failed to improve in other localities: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Department of Arizona, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, in convention assembled at Tucson, Ariz., April 1, 2, and 3, 1924, go on record as opposing the transfer of nontuberculosis patients from United States Veterans' Hospital No. 51, at Tucson, Ariz., but that separate quarters and mess hall be provided for such nontuberculosis patients.

Passed and adopted April 3, 1924.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. MAYFIELD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 354) for the relief of J. H. Toulouse (Rept. No. 408); and

A bill (S. 825) for the relief of Archibald L. Macnair (Rept. No. 409).

Mr. FERNALD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 95) to authorize the American National Red Cross to continue the use of temporary buildings now erected on square No. 172, Washington, D. C., reported it without amendment.

Mr. DIAL, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment:

A bill (H. R. 4200) to provide for the cleaning of the exterior of the post-office building at Cincinnati, Ohio; and

A bill (H. R. 6059) authorizing the conveyance to the city of Washington, Mo., of 10 feet of the Federal building site in said city for the extension of the existing public alley through the entire block from Oak to Lafayette Streets.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 3091) declaring an emergency in respect of certain agricultural commodities, to promote equality between agricultural commodities and other commodities, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 410) thereon.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 3104) for the relief of Elie Rivers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 3105) for the relief of Clara D. True; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 3106) to incorporate the American Psychological Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFLIN (by request):

A bill (S. 3107) to amend the United States cotton futures act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 3108) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Spencer, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRUCE:

A bill (S. 3109) for the relief of Frank H. Walker and Frank E. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3110) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty, suits for salvage service, and providing for the release of merchant vessels belonging to the United States from arrest and attachment in foreign jurisdictions, and for other purposes," approved March 9, 1920; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WARREN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 114) authorizing an investigation of the proposed Casper-Alcova irrigation project, Natrona County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

#### AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT TAX LAWS

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1786) to amend sections 5, 6, and 7 of the act of Congress making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, approved July 1, 1902, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT TO TAX REDUCTION BILL

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the revenue bill and ask that it be printed in the Record and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. HARRIS to the bill (H. R. 6715) to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, viz: Insert as an additional section the following:

"Sec. —. That there shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid in respect of the excess over the sum of \$1,000 which any person, family, firm, association, or corporation shall give, advance, pay, expend, subscribe, or contribute in the aggregate during any taxable year for the purpose, directly or indirectly, of influencing the nomination or defeat of any candidate or candidates for nomination, or the election or defeat of any candidate or candidates for office, or the success or defeat of any proposition, to be voted upon at any primary election or general or special election at which candidates for Members of the House of Representatives or for United States Senator or presidential electors are to be nominated or elected, a tax equal to 1,000 per cent of such excess; such expenditures or contributions to include all sums in any form contributed, subscribed, advanced, expended, paid or given to or for or against such candidate, candidates, or proposition or to or for party or other political committees or campaign funds, but not to include lawful expenditures made by such candidates or regular political committees or out of such campaign funds of moneys lawfully contributed to them.

"Every person, firm, and corporation required by law to make an income-tax return shall state therein specifically each item and the date thereof of all gifts, advances, expenditures, subscriptions, payments, and contributions made, and to whom, for the purpose of influencing the result of such primary and general elections and of all

taxes due thereon under the provisions of this section. And the treasurer or chairman of all State or congressional committees and of all political committees as defined in the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910, entitled 'An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected,' and of all associations or committees organized to promote or prevent, or engaged in promoting or preventing, the nomination or election of any candidate for Member of the House of Representatives or of the Senate of the Congress of the United States or for presidential elector or electors, shall within 30 days after the election to be held therefor file with the collector for the district where the headquarters or other office where such committee or association is located a return stating specifically all sums of money received, from whom received, and the date thereof."

#### SENATOR BURTON K. WHEELER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that he has been advised by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] that in view of his duties upon the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Finance, it will be impossible for him to serve on the committee to which he was recently appointed relating to an examination of matters touching the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. The Chair appoints in the place of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

#### INCREASE OF COAST GUARD

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the House, which was read, as follows:

#### Concurrent Resolution 21

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President pro tempore of the Senate in signing the enrolled bill (H. R. 6815) entitled "An act to authorize a temporary increase of the Coast Guard for law enforcement," be rescinded and that in the reenrollment of the said bill the following amendment be made, viz: On page 2, line 44, after the word "enlisted," insert "warrant."*

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the word "warrant" was inserted as an amendment to the bill on the floor of the Senate, and was concurred in by the other House, but in enrolling the bill it was left out. The purpose of the passage of the concurrent resolution is to correct the enrollment. I, therefore, move that the Senate concur in the House resolution.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

#### BELIEF OF AGRICULTURAL DISTRESS IN NEW MEXICO

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRAZIER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) for the relief of the drought-stricken farm areas of New Mexico.

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. NORRIS, Mr. McNARY, and Mr. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS subsequently said: Mr. President, may I ask the Chair who were appointed conferees on the part of the Senate on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) for the relief of the drought-stricken farm areas of New Mexico?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair was temporarily absent from the Chamber at the time the conferees were appointed, but he is informed the conferees appointed were the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask that I be relieved from serving on the conference committee, because it is a physical impossibility for me to give the attention to the matter which it will require. I ask that some other Senator may be appointed in my place?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Nebraska suggest the name of another conferee?

Mr. NORRIS. If the Chair desires to go down the list of names on the majority side of the committee, I suggest the next Senator on the list would be the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska, the Chair appoints the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] as a member of the conference committee in place of the Senator from Nebraska.

## RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2576) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate for a short time on the pending bill looking to permanent restriction of immigration coming into the United States. Conditions change and necessarily the laws of our country must be changed in order to meet changing conditions. Up to the year 1880 we had no immigration policy in this country, and there was no need of one prior to that time. We had a great empire in the West which was unsettled and which needed the acquaintance of the plow and the advance of civilization. The immigration which was coming from Europe at that time came unassisted; it came to find homes; it paid its own way. There were homestead lands which were practically free to the settler who came to claim them. The result was that the restrictions on immigration then practically related merely to good character and to health. This condition in regard to our law remained until the act of 1913 was passed, adopting an educational test.

Mr. President, I think in considering the problems which are involved in the pending bill we should go back to the purpose and object of restrictive legislation. We did not adopt the original immigration law for the purpose of restricting certain classes of immigration coming from Europe, but the main purpose in passing legislation of any kind on the subject was to protect certain American standards. The real issue involved is the standard of American life and American living. On account of the great opportunities that were presented to the people of America in developing this wonderful continent, with its great natural resources in mine, forest, and field, the standard of American living had risen far above the average of any other country in the world. It is naturally the desire of our people to maintain that standard, and it should be the desire of the legislative body to keep that standard at least as high as it has been in the past, if it can not be made higher in the future.

Where that standard is most difficult to be maintained is in the field of labor. The fight in all the civilized world from the beginning of civilization has been at the bread line, where the human being fought for his daily bread. There it is that labor must come in contact with competition. If the standard of living at home has been built higher than it is accustomed to be maintained abroad, and then the lower standard is brought in contact with the standard at home, of necessity the lower standard has a tendency to draw the higher one down to its level. Therefore, the principal purpose for which legislation to restrict immigration into this country has been entered upon is to protect American labor in its efforts to maintain the high standard of wages and the proper standard of living which it has built up in the decades that lie behind us.

Restriction of immigration is primarily a question that addresses itself, first, to the American laborer and the ideals of American labor; and there we find the basis of our Republic. It is that great class of citizens who toil for their living; that great class of our people who must fight through their lives in order that they may have comfortable homes for their families and suitable education for their children, who determine the real standard and on whom the success of the American Republic depends. To those who are in comfortable circumstances, to those who do not have to toil for their daily bread, this issue does not present itself; and, on the other hand, although those in comfortable circumstances in this country do their part by the Government, often being the captains that direct the force of energy, yet the real position, both in peace and war of the American Republic, is determined by the standards of the American toiler. So, that I regard this bill establishing a permanent policy for the restriction of immigration as one of the great and vital legislative endeavors that has come before the Congress of the United States in my time.

I say "permanent" because we all recognize the fact that, although some years ago we passed a bill restricting immigration along this line, at the time of its passage a limitation was placed on the life of the bill and it was more or less regarded as a temporary expedient, but to-day the Congress is invited to enter upon a permanent policy to take its place in the future life of the Nation.

Unless labor may have a fair and a living wage, then the whole life of labor in this country must move backward; and the only field in which the wage of labor can be protected and determined, in the last analysis, is the field of competition.

You might adopt temporary expedients; you might by law attempt to shelter this employment or that; but in the end, in times of stress and disaster, no law could maintain an artificial standard. The standards of American labor must be

maintained and can only be maintained in the great field of competition; and that field of competition is determined by the man who applies for employment who is within the continental limits of the United States.

I recognize that there is something in the argument that is being made that we may bring on a degree of hardship in some of our factories and foundries or in the development of our agricultural land if there is a continued restriction of immigration; but I think and always have thought that it is far better for the onward progress of the Nation to move more slowly, to develop more surely, and carry the great ideals of American life and American living along with the Nation as it moves onward.

I have always regarded this as one of the most important questions that confronted our country. As far back as the year 1902 I offered in the House of Representatives an amendment to a pending immigration bill providing for an educational test for immigrants coming into this country. It was adopted by the House, and came to the Senate; but the Senate rejected the amendment, and it went out of the bill, and for 11 years it stood at the door of Congress inviting enactment. In 1913, my colleague from Alabama, a splendid man and a statesman whose memory may be revered, the Hon. John L. Burnett, of Alabama, reported an immigration bill containing the same clause. It was enacted into law, and is the law of the land to-day. It was intended to raise the standard of immigration coming into this country so that a higher standard of immigration would be presented on the fighting line where it came into competition with the American laborer.

I say this because I want it understood from what I am to say hereafter that I have always believed in restricting immigration and believe in it now.

I am in favor of the passage of this bill in its main features as it was reported to the Senate; but there is an issue presented to the Senate that will come before us for consideration before the final vote on this bill, and I have taken the floor to make clear my own position in regard to that matter.

A few years ago, when we passed the existing law restricting immigration to 3 per cent of the foreign population of this country, as shown by the census of 1910, we adopted the standard of 1910 because it was the latest census report that was available. There was no other purpose in its adoption. It was fixed as the basis of restricted immigration. Before the Great War immigrants were coming into this country from Europe at the rate of more than a million of people per annum. In some years, I think, it ran as high as a million and a half people. It was a serious pressure on American labor to maintain its standards and meet the inflow of so great an amount of immigration; but after the enactment of the present law the immigration coming into the United States was reduced to some 350,000 immigrants. In other words, the inflow of competition at the labor market was reduced to a fourth or a fifth of what existed prior to that time. The dangers and difficulties that confronted the people of the United States were in a large measure removed, and do not exist to-day, and will exist in a much less degree if the pending bill is enacted.

Under the pending bill, providing for the admission of 2 per cent based on the census of 1910, the immigration coming into this country will amount to about 238,000 immigrants, reducing by a third the immigration now admitted into the United States. The census of 1890 showed over 7,000,000 of foreign-born residents in this country from northern and western Europe, and only 800,000 from southern and eastern Europe; but when you come to the census of 1910, by reason of death or removal, the residents of this country under the census of 1910 from northern and western Europe amounted to only 6,500,000, and from southern Europe to 5,200,000. It is perfectly clear, then, to anybody who desires to consider the facts—in truth, it is admitted—that the purpose of changing the present standard of the law is to discriminate against immigration coming from southern and eastern Europe.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I should not like to have that statement pass unanswered. The purpose, I think, of most of us in changing the quota basis is to cease from discriminating against the native born here and against the group of our citizens who come from northern and western Europe. I think the present system discriminates in favor of southeastern countries.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no doubt that the Senator from Pennsylvania understands his position clearly, but he does not make it clear to me.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. KING. I did not hear the Senator from Pennsylvania. Does the Senator, in that statement, assume to speak for the committee?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am speaking for myself and, I think, for many on the committee.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows that in the committee we adopted the 1910 basis.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I did not make the statement for the committee.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] that I entirely concur with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. My idea, and I think the idea of a majority of the committee, was to discriminate in favor of the American people; and if it should fall heavily upon one of the other nations, that was not a material matter. We looked only to the interests of the American people.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My friend from Tennessee has interpreted the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania, so I now understand what he meant. In other words, the Senator thinks that it is in the interest of the American people to cut down the immigration that is coming from southern Europe and to increase the immigration from northern Europe. That is just what I said. I did not apply it in that way, but I never try to disguise my position by words. The purpose of this change is not to reduce immigration coming into this country that is going to force itself up against the bread line. It is not a question of protecting the standard of American labor and American life and the American home—no; it is not that, because that is determined by the brawn and sinew of each man's arm. It is numbers that count in the standard of daily work. In fact, if there were any discrimination, the higher the standard of those you admitted in efficiency and ability to work, the greater competition you would have at the dinner pail.

The purpose of this change in the bill is quite evident. It is not to protect American labor. It is to discriminate against one class of immigration in favor of another.

If we were going to build our country from foreign lands, if we were going to allow unlimited immigration to flow into this country from all sources, I can readily see how that question might be material. But when we are limiting immigration to a very narrow field, to the field as to which those most in favor of restriction feel that we have reached the limit, as expressed in this legislation, the question of assimilation is not the serious question it would be if we had unrestricted immigration.

Some may ask me why I take this position and voted the other day against the admission of Japanese into this country. In the first place, let me say that the question of immigrants coming into this country is entirely a domestic issue. It has always been recognized as a domestic issue. It was proclaimed as a domestic issue when the treaty of peace was signed at Versailles and was recognized as a domestic issue at the Washington conference. It has been recognized by all countries in the world that each and every nation for itself must determine whom it will admit to its shores to come in contact with its own people.

More than that, if the situation were reversed the Empire of Japan would take exactly the position we are proposing to take in this bill. Why do I say that? Because when Japan was threatened with unlimited immigration coming from China she herself restricted Chinese immigration coming into Japan to the business classes and the merchant classes, and removed Chinese immigration from competition with the labor of Japan. I do not say this in any way to reflect on the Japanese people. They are a great people. They are an ancient people. They have proved their standing among the nations of the earth at the sword's point. The whole world recognizes that they are great warriors, and they have demonstrated their ability within little more than half a century to adopt the methods and the genius of western civilization and make them their own. It is not because we wish to reflect on them or because we discriminate against them that we have included in this bill a restriction against Japanese immigration coming to this country, but it is because of racial integrity.

There never was a race in the world that did not desire to maintain its own racial integrity. The Zulu chief in Africa resents the foreigner. The American Indian welcomed to his shore Columbus's sailors until they wanted to dominate the land and carry back the Indian women of America. Then they turned and massacred those whom Columbus had left in the port in the West Indies on his first trip.

Racial integrity will be maintained always by every race of people, and we can not permit the yellow and the brown races to come to this country in large numbers without destroying racial integrity. More than that, we have recognized that fact in our law, and have refused to grant citizenship to immigrants of either the yellow or the brown race.

No man should be admitted as an immigrant to this country unless the law itself expects at some time that he may become an American citizen and take part in the affairs of our Government, so there is a reason for the exclusion of those from the Asiatic shores without in any way reflecting on them that makes it entirely different from European immigration.

The great body of European immigration comes from the same source. Their blood has been mixed through the centuries. There may be a division in language. There may be some dissimilar racial characteristics. But they belong to the white blood, to the Caucasian race, and it is more opportunity that has made the division than it is racial characteristics.

As I said a moment ago, it is idle to say that this change is made on the basis of protecting the American standards and American labor, because under this bill as it stands we are going to allow to enter this country only 238,000 immigrants a year, and, if the change is made adopting the census of 1890, we will allow 169,000 immigrants to come in, making a change of competition at the bread line of only 69,000 human beings, half of whom at least will be not wage earners, but those who will be dependent on others. So that the number is insignificant as compared with the great flood of immigration that beat upon our shores but a few years ago.

More than that, if that were all that was involved, if it were only a question of the numbers that should be admitted, without reflecting on anybody, the basis could be reduced from 2 per cent to 1½ per cent figured on the census of 1910, and there would be fewer immigrants coming into this country than would come in under the 2 per cent provision with the census of 1890 as the basis.

So it is perfectly apparent that the purpose of the change in this bill is not to protect the standards of American labor, and not to protect the standards of American life and American ideals, but it is to discriminate against one class of European immigrants coming into our country as in favor of another.

Mr. President, if we will look at the census returns, and compare the number of immigrants who come in from these countries, we will find that from northern Europe, under the census of 1910, as compared with that of 1890, there is an increase from Austria, which is a German country, of 3,704; of 333 from Belgium; of 764 from Norway; of 596 from Estonia; of 2,269 from Finland; of 567 from the Netherlands; of 1,481 from Denmark; of 4,601 from Sweden; and of 221 from Switzerland, making a total increase from those countries of 14,536. There would be an increase of those coming from Czechoslovakia of 7,499; from Yugoslavia, 3,349; from Poland, 11,580; from Russia, 14,278; and from Italy, 23,949, making a total of 60,655.

There are some smaller countries involved on both sides of this equation where the difference in change would be less than 100 to each country, and I shall not worry the Senate by going into all the minute details; but the fact is that if we adopt the census of 1910 as the basis as against the proposed amendment making the census of 1890 the basis, we will get 60,000 additional immigrants from Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, Russia, and Italy. That is the issue.

I do not know how far Senators who are going to vote on this bill have analyzed conditions in those countries, but there is no portion of Europe where there is a finer industrial development, a worthier civilization, a straining after higher ideals and the best in government, in social life, and in industrial and agricultural development than will be found in Czechoslovakia. But we want to change the standard so that we will eliminate 7,499 from that country. Those who are coming from Yugoslavia are comparatively few in the estimates.

To Poland we close the doors, and yet if I remember rightly on one of the great squares in this Capital City, facing the White House, within my time of service in one of the branches of the Congress, we have erected a statue to the heroism of a great Pole who came here during the Revolutionary War and drew his sword and offered his life to sustain the independence of the American Government. They are white. They belong to the race of northern Europe. They have established a republic of their own; and although in the late war a large portion of Poland was under the control of Germany, the heartbeats of the entire people were with our cause and with our soldiers.

Russia? What is the difference between the Prussian, whom you desire to admit, and the Russian across the border? They

come from the blood of northern Europe. They are both Slavic in their original ancestry. The difference is that one has had the advantage of a development of civilization to a longer extent than the other. But in Russia we find a great white race, a pure white race, a race that belongs to what we in later years call the Nordic tribes. It has produced great soldiers, for we must not forget that on the battle lines in the early years of the Great War, before England was ready to go to the relief of France, before we were involved, this same Russian peasant, whom you now desire to condemn and write against his race the bar sinister, held the line for civilization. Between 1914 and 1916 if the Russian line had broken the German Empire would have succeeded and have been the dominant power of the world to-day. Yet by your action to-day you are writing the bar sinister against this race of people who held the line of civilization for you and for me.

Then the other race are the people of Italy, 23,000. They are not excluded because they are fighting the bread line. You could exclude them at the bread line without reflecting on their racial characteristics or their standard among nations. If that is all you desire, reduce your percentage from 2 to 1½ per cent and you will get less people than you would have by adopting the standard of 1890.

What are the Italians? You object to some of them because you do not think they are up to the standard that you want. The Lombards of Italy are as much Nordic in their type as your own race. They have been great warriors in their time and are to-day. All the arts of civilization have been bred and grown in their midst, sculpture, painting, and the other arts, literature, all the modern sciences. But a few, you say, do not come up to your standard. Why, Senators, if we are to be judged by the minority there are places in continental United States that will not measure up to the standards of European life. If you want to pick a spot on the universe to judge of the whole, look at your own country. Reverse the situation. If we are to be judged of by the minority, 10 per cent of the population of continental United States is black. Europe would not accept that as a standard under which to allow American immigration to go into Europe. But are we to be judged as a Nation because our standard does not ring true all along the line? No! Are you to judge of a nation itself that you are weighing and measuring in the balance because forsooth some small portion of that nation does not measure up to the ideal standard which you desire?

No, Mr. President; I say that this change is a mistake. There is nothing to be accomplished by it that will aid in the maintaining of the high standard of American labor and American life that we all desire to accomplish. They are only endangered at the line of competition, the bread line. But when you say to a very large portion of the people of the United States, citizens of this country, men and women who have the right to vote and sit in the councils of your Nation, "We draw this line against you and yours because we believe that you are unworthy of the high standard of American life and living," you are doing an act of injustice to those people, an act to which I shall not commit myself by my vote.

More than that, why should we forget that the same Italian people were in the three-power pact when the Great War broke out? They refused to invade France. They refused to tear down the last protecting wall which would save the political life of France. Then, in the end, they joined our allies. Their boys with your boys battled together in the Great War. The boys of their race who had adopted America as their home stood on the battle line with your sons and with mine. One great division from the State of New York was largely made up of the sons of these people, and when the killing days in the Argonne came they held the line. They held it for you and for me. And yet you are prepared to write the bar sinister against their names and say that they are unworthy of mixing with your blood. That is what you mean, and that is what the proposed amendment means.

Mr. President, I have been for restricted immigration and have said so on the floors of the Congress for more than 25 years. It is no new thing to me. As I said, I myself proposed the first educational test to protect American labor and American standards. But when you ask me to go to the point where I must discriminate against and bar the men who stood in the battle line with my son and fought the fight with him I decline to go with you. It is not American, it is not democratic to do it.

The great genius of this Republic was due to the fact that America opened its gates on the rock-bound coast of New England to provide a harbor of refuge for the Pilgrim Fathers who were driven from old England by persecution. Then but a few years later the scene changed, and within a

hundred miles of the Capital of the United States the Catholics of England found refuge on the shores of Maryland from persecution. Then the sons of New England and Maryland met and wrote the Constitution of the United States, which is the guaranty of our liberty, the protection of our homes, and the standard of our Republic and our lives.

The question of proscription is nothing new. It was here at the birth of the Democratic Party. It was out of this idea of intolerance that, under John Adams, the alien and sedition laws were written in the history of this country. The greatest Democrat who ever lived, standing for human rights, human liberty, and freedom of conscience, carried the issue to the country, and Thomas Jefferson became the President of the United States.

Under his administration the alien and sedition laws were removed from the statute books of the country. Yet the spirit of intolerance came down through the decades, and again showed itself in the fifties, when a party calling itself the American Party of the United States and known in history as the Know Nothing Party proclaimed the same idea of racial and religious intolerance.

I am glad to say that the party of which I am a member, the party in whose principles I hold faith, has always met this issue squarely and stood for human rights and human liberty. I wish to read into the Record of the Senate how that party proclaimed itself when it met in convention for the campaign of 1856. Section 10 of that Democratic platform reads as follows:

That the liberal principles embodied by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence and sanctioned in the Constitution, which makes ours the land of liberty and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, have ever been cardinal principles in the Democratic faith, and every attempt to abridge the privilege of becoming citizens and the owners of soil among us ought to be resisted with the same spirit which swept the alien and sedition laws from our statute books; and

Whereas, since the foregoing declaration was uniformly adopted by our predecessors in national conventions an adverse political and religious test has been secretly organized by a party claiming to be exclusively American, it is proper that the American Democracy should clearly define its relation thereto and declare its determined opposition to all secret political societies, by whatever name they may be called:

Resolved, That the foundation of this Union of States having been laid in and its prosperity, expansion, and preeminent example in free government built upon entire freedom in matters of religious concernment and no respect of person in regard to rank or place of birth, no party can justly be deemed national, constitutional, or in accordance with American principles which bases its exclusive organization upon religious opinions and accidental birthplace. And hence a political crusade in the nineteenth century and in the United States of America against Catholic and foreign born is neither justified by the past history or the future prospects of the country nor in unison with the spirit of toleration and enlarged freedom which peculiarly distinguishes the American system of popular government.

Mr. President, I do not make that declaration; other Senators do not make that declaration; but, as that platform states, from the day of Jefferson down to the adoption of this clause in the platform of 1856 it was the principle, the great and enduring principle, of the Democratic Party.

The party of Thomas Jefferson has lived for human rights; it has lived for human freedom; it has always stood for freedom of religious worship, and if the hour has come when the democracy of America can no longer ring true to the fundamental principles of this great party, then the seed of discord and corruption has already entered its soul and its destiny is ended.

What did Thomas Jefferson leave behind him to write his name among the foremost of our great Republic? It was not that he had been a great President of the United States; it was not that he had been ambassador to France in the hour of danger and difficulty facing the young American Republic; and it was not that he had been Governor of the great State of Virginia. No; when he came to die he wrote his own epitaph and he ordered written on his tombstone at Monticello—

Here lies the body of Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, of the statute of religious freedom in Virginia, and father of the University of Virginia.

Three great achievements, all standing for human rights and human liberty, for freedom of men; and yet we have reached a time when the great party to which I hold allegiance, the party of Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, the party of Mason, who wrote the Bill of Rights, the party of Madison, the father of the Constitution, is preparing to reverse the principle that it declared in its platform of 1856—

and that is the foundation stone of the party to which we give allegiance—and exclude immigrants from this country, not because they endanger American civilization, not because they endanger labor at the bread line, but, forsooth, because we have become so nice that we do not wish to associate with people coming from particular foreign countries. In other words, instead of standing for the great principles of human rights and human liberty, and freedom of conscience, we are going to tear down our standard and yield our cause to passion and to prejudice. On that ground I will not follow.

There is no discrimination in the present law; there is no reason for its change; there is no danger to American ideals in the bill reported by the Senate Committee, but if the change shall be made it will be made for the purpose directly, and for no other purpose, of discriminating against one class of people in favor of another, on grounds that are not democratic and not American.

Mr. SHIELDS obtained the floor.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SHIELDS. I yield.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yesterday afternoon the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] both inquired of me whether there was going to be any record vote during the remainder of the day as far as I could tell, and I assured them that there would not be. In giving that assurance I meant to say that no yeas-and-nays vote would be called for on any proposition so far as I could see. They very naturally interpreted what I said as meaning that there would be no vote on any subject. As a matter of fact, the Senate did vote without yeas and nays on the Japanese-exclusion section which I offered, and I have unmeaningly done them an injustice in leading them to think there would not be any vote. For that reason, Mr. President, and at the request of both of those Senators, I ask unanimous consent for a reconsideration of that vote and an immediate yeas-and-nays vote on the question, so that they may enter their dissent to the adoption of the section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRAZIER in the chair). Is there any objection?

Mr. SHIELDS. Does the Senator want an immediate vote?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If the Senator will yield for that purpose; otherwise, I can not presume on his courtesy.

Mr. SHIELDS. If I do not yield the floor, and if that is an accommodation to the Senator, I will do so.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, may I ask what the Senator's request was? I have just come into the Chamber.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have just explained that unwittingly I did an injustice to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], both of whom wanted to vote against the Japanese-exclusion section. I assured them there would be no record vote, meaning no yeas-and-nays vote; but a viva voce vote was taken, and they were not here because of my assurance. I am now asking that without discussion, and without its resulting in the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] losing the floor, the Senate shall now take a yeas-and-nays vote on the adoption of that section.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, if I do not yield the floor, and there is no discussion, I will yield for the accommodation of the Senator.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have no objection; but as the bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and there will be another opportunity for a vote when the bill goes into the Senate, I should like to ask the Senator why we should call the roll now?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I suggested that, but the Senators who are concerned felt that they would like to register their protest promptly, and that is the reason for the unusual request which I make of the Senate.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to say just this word: I thought I had left word yesterday that I should be notified in case that amendment came up before the Senate; but I think the parties with whom I left the word overlooked the matter, and I was not notified, or I would have been here, of course, at the time.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I did not hear the Chair's statement in regard to my agreement to yield the floor only for this vote on condition that I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Tennessee. Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none. The vote whereby the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered, and, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the yeas and nays are ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. There seems to be a misapprehension as to what is the pending question. Is it not upon the adoption of the exclusion amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the question.

The READING CLERK. On page 15, after line 17, the Senate on yesterday inserted the following amendment:

(c) No alien ineligible to citizenship shall be admitted to the United States unless such alien (1) is admissible as a nonimmigrant under the provisions of section 3; or (2) unless such alien is an immigrant who continuously for at least two years immediately preceding the time of his application for admission to the United States has been, and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of, carrying on the vocation of minister of any religious denomination, or professor of a college, academy, seminary, or university; or (3) unless such alien is an immigrant who is a bona fide student over 18 years of age and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of study at an accredited school, college, academy, seminary, or university, particularly designated by him and approved by the Secretary of Labor; or (4) unless such alien is the wife or the unmarried child under 18 years of age of an immigrant admissible under subdivision (2) of this paragraph and is accompanying or following to join him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the calling of the roll.

The reading clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. WILLIS (when Mr. FESS's name was called). My colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], is unavoidably absent. If he were present, I am advised that he would vote for the pending amendment.

Mr. McCORMICK (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], which I transfer to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. ERNST. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], but I understand that he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I vote "yea."

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. My colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of California] is absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of New Mexico (after having voted in the affirmative). I observe that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD], with whom I am paired, is absent from the Chamber. I have already voted, but I understand that the Senator from Maine would vote as I have voted, and I therefore permit my vote to stand.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is absent owing to illness in his family. If present, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

I wish also to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 4, as follows:

## YEAS—71

Adams	Ernst	Ladd	Robinson
Bayard	Fletcher	Lodge	Sheppard
Borah	Frazier	McCormick	Shields
Brandegee	George	McKellar	Shipstead
Brookhart	Gerry	McKinley	Shortridge
Broussard	Glass	McNary	Simmons
Bursum	Gooding	Mayfield	Smith
Cameron	Hale	Moses	Smoot
Capper	Harrell	Neely	Spencer
Caraway	Harris	Norbeck	Stephens
Copeland	Harrison	Norris	Swanson
Curtis	Heflin	Oddie	Trammell
Dale	Howell	Overman	Underwood
Dial	Johnson, Minn.	Pepper	Wadsworth
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Wheeler
Elkins	Kendrick	Ralston	Willis
	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	

## NAYS—4

Colt	McLean	Sterling	Warren
------	--------	----------	--------

## NOT VOTING—21

Ashurst	Ferris	Lenroot	Walsh, Mass.
Ball	Fess	Owen	Watson
Couzens	Greene	Ransdell	Weller
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Reed, Mo.	
Edwards	King	Stanfield	
Fernald	La Follette	Stanley	

So the amendment of Mr. REED of Pennsylvania was agreed to.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, the future immigration policy of the United States is challenging the most serious attention of the American people. They demand that this policy be changed from one of practically the open door to all peoples of the world to one of rigid restriction if not absolute prohibition of immigration. This is a matter of the greatest importance and must have prompt and favorable consideration. The immigrants we are receiving to-day are of a different character from those that came in the early history of our country, and the great numbers in which they are arriving is a cause of serious alarm and menaces the purity of the blood, the homogeneity, and the supremacy of the American people and the integrity and perpetuity of our representative form of government.

The highest duty of every nation is to protect its nationals and its government. Our constitutional form of government is recognized to be the wisest that was ever constructed and put into successful operation. We have boundless natural resources, surpassing those of all other countries in variety and value. But it is the sturdy and indomitable people who populated this country and founded our Government, developed these vast resources, who have made this the greatest, richest, and most powerful Nation in the world. If we permit the great American type of citizenship to be diluted, mongrelized, and destroyed, our civilization and free institutions will not survive. No mongrel race has ever achieved greatness in peace or war.

The people of the United States recognize in these great hordes of new immigrants a foreign invasion fraught with consequences as disastrous and humiliating as those of a military invasion. They are as much opposed to a peaceful conquest through the migrations of millions of undesirable alien immigrants as a conquest by an army with force and arms.

Mr. President, the apprehensions of the people are well founded, and conditions call for prompt and vigorous action. We must have a new and permanent policy which will prohibit further migrations of alien peoples and preserve the purity and integrity of American citizenship and republican institutions.

#### CONDITIONS REQUIRING LEGISLATION

I will briefly review the facts that have produced these alarming conditions and call for this legislation.

There have been great migrations of peoples from one country to another in all ages, and many of them have submerged and supplanted the peoples inhabiting the countries to which they migrated and overthrown their governments.

The migrations to the United States in recent years have broken all precedents. Where hundreds of thousands migrated to other countries, millions have come to America. Since 1820, 35,000,000 aliens have migrated to the United States. The great majority of them have come since 1880, 10,000,000 during the last 15 years. Comparatively few came before 1880, the wonderful increase of our population up to that time being almost entirely from colonial stock. These migrations gradually increased from 1880 to 1914. From 1902 to 1914 over 750,000 came annually, and during five of these years more than 1,000,000 came each year, 1,218,480 arriving in 1914.

The census of 1920 shows that we have a total white population of 94,820,915, of which number 58,421,956 are of native-born parentage, and that 36,228,958 are foreign born or of foreign-born parentage—13,712,754 foreign born, 15,694,539 of parents born abroad and 6,991,665 of mixed parentage—that is one parent born abroad and the other native; and that only about one-half of the foreign born are naturalized American citizens.

This census further shows that of the population of our cities there are 24,556,729 born of native parents, and 26,063,355 of foreign birth or foreign stock, and of these 10,386,963 are foreign born. The city of New York, with a population of 5,600,000 has 4,200,000 of foreign stock, of which 1,900,000 are alien by birth. Chicago out of a total population of 2,700,000 has 1,940,000, or 75 per cent, foreign stock. There are other cities where the majority of the population are foreign born or of foreign stock.

New England has almost changed its original stock of people; over 60 per cent of the population consists of those of foreign birth or whose parentage is foreign wholly or in part. Rhode Island leads all the States with a foreign stock of 69 per cent, followed by Massachusetts, with 66 per cent; Connecticut and North Dakota, with 65 per cent; Minnesota, 64 per cent; New York, 62 per cent; Wisconsin, 59 per cent; and New Jersey, 58 per cent. The total foreign stock for the Southern States, including Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas, is only 8 per cent as against 40 per cent in the rest of the country.

There are more than two-fifths of our white population foreign born and of foreign or mixed foreign parentage of the present generation. Without reference to the character of

the individual immigrants, this is ample cause for alarm and serious apprehension for the safety and supremacy of the American stock, who built our free institutions and are responsible for their maintenance.

These conditions have never existed or been approached in the history of our Government, and they fully justify the interest of all patriotic Americans in restricting immigration.

#### THE OLD IMMIGRANTS

Mr. President, the thirteen original States were British colonies, settled by immigrants from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and northern and western Europe—France, Holland, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries, less than 10 per cent coming from the latter countries. These peoples were originally of the same common origin and stock, having much the same love of liberty and freedom and principles of Government, and comparatively easily assimilated.

The colonists from Great Britain and Ireland brought with them the customs, the language, ideals, aspirations, and the laws of that great Anglo-Saxon nation and established a Government which secured for them the inalienable rights of personal liberty, private property, security of the home, freedom of religious belief, free speech and press, trial by jury, and other rights of a free and sovereign people. The Nation which they created here is of the great Anglo-Saxon family, with the fixed principles and ideals which these people have carried with them and upheld in every part of the world they have settled and controlled.

The immigrants who came here from 1787 to 1880 were of the same stock, in about the same proportions, as those who founded our Nation and our Government, those coming from continental Europe increasing about 25 per cent in the last 20 years of that period. They came here for the purpose of acquiring homes, enjoying our free institutions, and becoming loyal American citizens. They brought their families with them and distributed themselves all over the country and were assimilated and merged into one homogeneous people with one language and attached to the same laws and the same principles and form of government. They assisted in subduing the forests, clearing the lands, and building our great cities and developing our great natural resources.

#### THE NEW IMMIGRANTS

Mr. President, the character and nationality of immigrants have changed since 1880. Immigration for some years has been almost entirely from southern and eastern Europe and Asia, countries whose nationals are racially different from the old immigrants. The total number of immigrants to the United States from northern and western Europe between 1871 and 1880 was about 2,700,000 and the total from southern and eastern Europe only 181,000, but between 1901 and 1910 the total of the former was 2,000,000 and those from southern and eastern Europe increased to 6,128,000. While previous to 1900 immigration from southern and eastern Europe constituted only 9 per cent of the European immigration, since then it has increased to 75 per cent of the total. More than three-fourths of the immigrants during the last 10 years came from Italy, Greece, Hungary, Poland, the Balkans, Russia, and some from Asia.

We have many splendid men and women, loyal and patriotic citizens, from all these countries who came to make America their home and to become Americans. We respect and honor them and are glad to have them. They are entitled to equal opportunities and equal rights with those who came before them. There should be no discrimination against them. They are all now Americans and many of them are successful business men and able and distinguished citizens, holding high positions and offices of trust, honor, and power. What I am now going to say does not apply to this class of immigrants.

The great majority of the present-day immigrants do not, like the old ones, distribute themselves over the States, mingle with and become absorbed in the great body of American people, and build homes, cultivate lands, or, in other words, become permanent and loyal American citizens. They do not have the social characteristics of the original stock. They are not assimilable and do not seem to desire to be assimilated. They bring with them lower standards of living and labor conditions and strange customs and ideals of social justice and government. Civil and religious liberty do not attract them, but they come here to enjoy our prosperity and possess the country our forefathers redeemed from the wilderness and improved as none other in the world.

They largely congregate in cities and form communities of their several foreign nationalities; they speak their own languages and train their children to do so. They continue to

cherish their former traditions, social aspirations, customs, and ideals of government, and more than half of them remain un-naturalized and owe allegiance to foreign governments. There are more than 3,000,000 of them who can not read or write English and perhaps 2,000,000 who can not speak our language. The city of Monessen, Pa., has a population of 21,000, only 3,000 of whom can speak the English language. There are whole wards in New York and Chicago where the English language is seldom heard and no newspapers printed in it read. These conditions are the natural consequence when a large number of immigrants come from one country.

The investigation of the great strike of the employees of the United States Steel Corporation developed the fact that more than one-half of the strikers were foreigners, representing 21 nationalities and speaking as many different languages.

Thirty-five per cent of those immigrants are illiterate and densely ignorant, and many of them are physically, mentally, and morally unsound. Secretary Davis recently stated that 20 per cent of the inmates of the insane asylums of our country are men and women of foreign birth. A large number of them are of the lawless class and undesirable citizens in every respect. It is well known that the governments of the countries from which these people come encourage and stimulate this class of immigration and keep at home the best of their nationals.

Mr. Secretary Davis, after a careful investigation, classified the present-day immigrants as follows:

Very superior	153, 188
Superior	403, 700
High average	1, 016, 211
Average	3, 702, 904
Low average	2, 296, 914
Inferior	4, 276, 573
Very inferior	2, 080, 262

We have received over 3,000,000 immigrants in 30 years below normal mentality, and their progeny have added to the number of degenerates, criminals, and inmates of insane asylums, burdening our country with obligations which have more than offset the real value of the desirable immigrants.

#### THE MENACE OF COMMUNISM

Mr. President, these undesirable immigrants are seriously endangering the peace and tranquillity of our people and the supremacy of our laws and Government. There are many of them who begin to plan to destroy our institutions as soon as they arrive in this country. They are not content with the American principle of equal opportunity, but demand equal conditions without deserving them. There are many who are intolerant of all restraint and all law and would introduce into this country the wildest doctrines of Bolshevism. We get the majority of the communists, the I. W. W.'s, the dynamiters, and assassins of public officers from the ranks of the present-day immigrant.

Communism has become a menace to our Government. There are many organizations, under different names, which are constantly plotting to overthrow our Government by force and violence when conditions offer favorable opportunity for such action. They have made insidious efforts to obtain control of organized labor; but, while it is said they have made converts in some of the unions, Mr. Gompers and other labor leaders, with commendable patriotism, have met and thwarted their efforts. They denounce all interests and all organizations not in accord with their views, and only recently in a meeting in Chicago the American Legion was denounced as an auxiliary of capital and all workers were ordered to withdraw from its membership. The strength and activities of the communists are found in the eastern and northern cities, where are the great body of undesirable immigrants. We have very few of them in the South, where the immigrants are of the better class, and are making good citizens; but this is a national problem, and I am discussing it from a national standpoint.

Mr. President, there are to-day more than a thousand daily, weekly, and monthly publications, in 42 different languages, printed in the United States which openly and defiantly advocate the overthrow of our Government. In addition to these, socialistic and anarchistic papers, advocating violence and bloodshed, published in Europe in foreign languages, are distributed in our country. Meetings are held in all centers of the foreign population in our cities and speeches made in foreign languages urging bloody revolution and ultimate confiscation and destruction of all private property.

The Communist, the official organ of the Communist Party, which is printed in a half dozen foreign languages, advocates organized revolution in the United States. Addressing the working men and women, it declared in so many words:

You must organize the shops and use the strike against the Government; you must be prepared so that when the revolutionary crisis comes you can turn a general strike against the Government into an armed uprising to overthrow all government.

There are said to be 2,000,000 radical communists in the United States. These people made necessary the espionage laws of the war, which unexplained, are a reflection upon the patriotism of the country.

Present conditions in Europe tend to increase immigration to this country of the idle, thriftless, and criminal classes. It is estimated that but for the restrictive legislation enacted in 1921, no less than 2,000,000 of these undesirable classes would have come to our shores from southern and eastern Europe during the last year.

If we allow this to continue, the character and distinguishing qualities of our nationals will be changed, and physical, mental, and moral degeneracy of the American people will inevitably follow, and our Government will be altered in conformity with their socialistic views and ideals.

#### NEW IMMIGRATION POLICY REQUIRED

Mr. President, the great migrations of the nationals of foreign countries must stop. We must adopt a fixed and firm policy, not apologetic, but militant and aggressive for that purpose. We must declare to the nations of the world now and for all time in no uncertain terms that we will not longer allow great migrations of people from any country to our shores. America has too long been made the dumping ground for their undesirable populations. As a sovereign nation it is our solemn duty to foster and protect the purity of blood, the characteristics, and ideals of the American people. The harmony and unity of our nationals must be preserved. We will do this without consulting the convenience and interest of any other government. Their officious interferences and protests against this bill are an insult to our sovereignty and should be resented by all Americans.

We do not need immigration. We are a world power and can safely depend and rely upon our own people for prosperity and defense of our country. The immigrants of to-day come to share our prosperity and not to contribute to it. The natural increase of our nationals will enable us to keep up with the populations of other countries. We do not want a densely populated country with the attendant evils found in such countries in Europe and Asia. Overpopulation destroys individualism and independence and weakens the physical and mental development of the people. Great Britain, France, Germany, nor any other civilized country permits hordes of immigrants from foreign countries.

#### IMMIGRATION A DOMESTIC POLICY

Mr. President, the problem which confronts us is not international. Immigration is a domestic problem solely within the control of each sovereign State. This question was fully discussed when the Senate had under consideration the approval of the covenant of the League of Nations contained in the Versailles Treaty. One of the most important reservations reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations was that declaring immigration to be a domestic question and reserving to the United States the absolute control of immigration to our country.

I consider the possible interference of foreign governments in our immigration policies to be one of the gravest consequences which would follow our becoming a member of the League of Nations. The protests that Italy, Rumania, Japan, and other countries are making against this legislation confirms this apprehension.

Our immigration policy must be determined by the American people, and the laws for its enforcement written by Americans and for America. The welfare of the Nation must control. Temporary economic, industrial, and commercial interests must give way to the safety of our people and our institutions. Contractors for cheap labor and foreign steamship companies reaping great profits from transporting immigrants, must not be allowed to further influence our immigration laws.

#### AMERICA HAS AIDED EUROPE

Mr. President, the argument that the policy and laws proposed are harsh and unjust to the people of Europe is without foundation in fact, humanity, or justice. We are under no legal or moral obligations to receive and provide for them. America has done more for Europe than Europe has done for herself. We have been taking care of their surplus population, good and bad, to the prejudice of our people and our institutions for the last 40 years. We lent them more than \$10,000,000,000 during the last war, which most of them show no disposition to repay.

Since the war we have given them nearly \$1,000,000,000 in charity and have no evidence of their gratitude. Their constant demands upon us are for more favors and for more money.

Notwithstanding these facts, we have among us men and women who are constantly insisting that we must "do something for Europe." Just what they mean, they do not say and I do not know, unless it is to contribute more of the earnings and savings of the American people to support the peoples of those countries while they are devoting themselves to their racial, commercial, and territorial prejudices and struggles. There are some who are insisting that we release their indebtedness to us, in order, as they say, to encourage them in their economic and industrial pursuits. They do not seem to have any consideration for the interest of the American people, who need that money to pay the Liberty loan bonds sold to raise it.

#### POLICY OF WASHINGTON

I believe in the policies of Washington and Jefferson: "Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none," and which were eloquently approved by President Woodrow Wilson in his speech made in Washington, on May 6, 1914, when he said: "There are just as vital things stirring now that concern the existence of the Nation as were stirring then;" to wit, in Washington's time, and every man who worthily stands in this presence should examine himself and see whether he has the full conception of what it means. America should live her own life.

Washington saw it when he wrote his farewell address. It was not merely because of passing and transitory circumstances that Washington said we must keep from entangling alliances. It was because he saw that no country has yet set its face in the same direction in which America had set her face. We can not form alliances with those who are not going our way, and in our might and in confidence and definiteness of our own purpose we need not and we should not form alliances with any nation in the world. Those who are right, those who study their consciences in determining their policy, those who hold their honor higher than their advantages do not need alliances. When we go out from this presence, we ought to take the idea with us that we, too, are devoted to the purpose of enabling America to live her own life, to be the most just, the most progressive, the most honorable, the most enlightened nation in the world.

Mr. President, I have no racial or religious prejudice against any of the Caucasian races, and I would not discriminate against any of them, but as an American citizen, whose paternal ancestors fought with Washington and assisted in driving the British armies from American shores, I am in favor of the American people and the American Government against all races and against all nations. I believe that the sound political policy of the American people is to keep Europe out of America and to keep America out of Europe.

While we have no right to suggest what other governments should do with their surplus populations, we know that there are vast unoccupied countries which are open to colonization. Africa is a vast country, sparsely populated and of great natural resources almost wholly undeveloped. France, Italy, Belgium, and Great Britain have great dominions there which these people may occupy and develop. Let them go there and work and build up that country and establish their own forms of government as our forefathers did in America. We are not called upon to divide our country or our prosperity—the result of years of hardship, sacrifice, and industry—with them.

#### FOREIGN INFLUENCE

If we permit foreign nations to continue to colonize their nationals here as they have in the last few years, those of foreign blood will soon outnumber the American stock and control our Government. They are now exercising great influence in some sections of the country. There are many of them now among us who are opposing this legislation, not in their own interest but for that of the peoples of the countries from which they emigrated. Their opposition to legislation for the protection of American citizenship and American institutions is not creditable or patriotic. Their sympathies ought to be solely with America and Americans. It proves that residence and naturalization will not make Americans. The true and loyal American must be for his country in heart, soul, and body, and against all other peoples and all other governments whose interest conflict with our interest and safety.

Congress, I repeat, should declare that the present and future policy of the United States is opposed to the migrations of the nationals of other countries to its borders, and should pass appropriate legislation to enforce this policy.

#### THE PRESENT LAW

Mr. President, the adoption of a fixed policy is the important thing. The means for the enforcement of this policy are only secondary and can be changed from time to time as may be necessary for the exclusion of aliens. Congress has for years recognized the necessity of legislation restricting immigration. A bill for this purpose was passed in 1912 and vetoed by President Taft. What is known as the Burnett immigration bill, passed in 1917, contained about the same provisions as that bill. It prohibits the admission of immigrants who are idiots or insane, paupers, vagrants, polygamists, prostitutes, those afflicted with tuberculosis or any other loathsome, dangerous, or contagious disease, those convicted of felonies involving moral turpitude, anarchists and those who oppose all kinds of organized government, those who favor the assassination of public officers and unlawful destruction of public property, contract laborers and all aliens over 16 years physically capable who can not read the English or some other language, and any other delinquents, so as to prevent all undesirable immigration. This bill was vetoed because of the educational test, but it was passed notwithstanding and is now the law.

That bill did not go far enough—there was no restriction upon the number of immigrants, and too many loopholes for evasion. Congress, to remedy this defect, passed May 19, 1921, and continued in force for two years, by resolution May 11, 1922, what is known as the quota law, under which emigration from foreign countries was restricted to an annual quota equal to 3 per cent of the nationals of each particular nation already in the United States, as shown by the census of 1910, subject to the prohibitions and provisions of the Burnett law. This law does not apply to the other countries of North America nor those of South and Central America, and allows exceptions in favor of the relatives and dependents of residents in the United States and certain other nationals of other countries, as provided in the Burnett law, which it supplements.

The aggregate of the annual quota allowed under this law is 357,000, but almost an equal number may be admitted under the exceptions. The year before this law was passed we received 805,228 immigrants.

#### THE JOHNSON-REED BILL

Mr. President, the bill now under consideration, known as the Reed bill, reduces the annual quota of immigrants for each country to 2 per cent, based upon the census of 1910, which, with some exceptions to be stated, is practically the same as the Johnson bill just passed by the House of Representatives. The other countries of North America and those of Central and South America and the West India islands are not included in the quota restrictions, and immigrants as before are allowed to enter our country without limitation as to numbers. Officials of foreign governments and their families, aliens visiting the United States temporarily, as tourists, for business, study, or pleasure, and some others are also excepted from the quota restrictions.

There are no exceptions, as in the Burnett bill and subsequent legislation, in favor of the near relatives and dependents of immigrants in the United States, but preference under the quota limitation is given to the unmarried child under 21 years of age, father or mother over 55 years of age, the husband or the wife of a citizen of the United States, which is deemed sufficient to allow to come in those occupying these relations to all immigrants now in this country and who have manifested their determination to become Americans by being properly naturalized.

The bill also contains provisions requiring written applications of the nationals of other countries proposing to emigrate to the United States, to our consular agents abroad who are vested with broad powers and discretion in allowing or refusing certificates giving them the right of admission, subject, however, to be rejected at the port of entry if found to be undesirable immigrants within the provisions of the immigration laws of the United States. These provisions are believed to constitute a selective system in the country of the nativity of the immigrant, which, while it may not be perfect, is a step in advance and will eventually prevent the coming of all the undesirable and prohibitive class of immigrants to our shores.

The aggregate annual quota of immigrants allowed under the bill as reported to the Senate, 2 per cent based upon the census of 1910, exclusive of exceptions, is 240,459. There are sev-

ar. 1 amendments pending, one of which suspends all immigration for five years, excluding from the restrictions certain near relatives of the citizens of the United States and the class contained in the exceptions in the Reed bill, except that immigrants from Canada, Mexico, Central and South American countries are also excluded. Another amendment fixes the quota at 2 per cent and based upon the census of 1890 and applies to all countries, which will reduce the number of immigrants allowed to enter our country each year to 169,803, exclusive of the special exceptions contained in the bill under consideration. The bill also contains numerous administrative provisions which will greatly aid in controlling immigration and immigrants, and which I favor.

Mr. President, I will support the amendment proposing to suspend immigration to the United States for three years, with the exceptions stated hereinbefore liberally construed and administered in the cause of humanity and the just expectation of those whom we have already admitted to citizenship in this country and are now a part of us and Americans, because I believe, for the reasons which I have already stated, that it will require that time at least to assimilate those of foreign birth and some of foreign parentage now in this country, and without this we can not maintain the unity and harmony of our citizenship.

Should the Senate not approve this amendment, which is probable, I will then support the amendment fixing the annual quota at 2 per cent based upon the census of 1890, which was approved in the House by more than two-thirds majority, insuring that, if necessary, it will be passed over an Executive veto.

Mr. President, I will not go into any analysis of how the adoption of the census of 1890 will affect the different nations of the world. I will not discuss the protests of some of them, nor the supposed equities asserted. They have no rights to protest and no equities which we are called upon to recognize. The admission of their nationals to this country is not a matter of right and rests entirely upon comity and tolerance, which should not be permitted to interfere with the material interests of our country. The proposed law is solely for the benefit of America and Americans of to-day and for all future time. If it is discriminatory, it is in the interest and for the benefit of Americans and not because of any prejudice against other peoples. We will not discriminate against any nation for the benefit of another nation. When the law affects nations differently it is because it is required by the interests of our own people, for whom it is our right and duty to legislate.

I am frank to say that I believe if we must have immigration it is best for it to come from Great Britain and Ireland and the countries of western and northern Europe, as in the early days, as these people are more like our people in their characteristics and their ideas and principles of government conform more to ours than the peoples of southern Europe and Asia, and they are therefore more easily assimilated. But I can not now see how further immigration from any country can contribute to the safety, happiness, and prosperity of our people and the permanence of our Government, and I would be glad to see all immigration, with the exception hereinbefore stated in favor of relatives and others, prohibited for a reasonable time. This is for the interest of all Americans, whether they came early or last year.

Mr. President, the American people are aroused to the necessity of stopping the great migrations of aliens to our country, and they almost unanimously favor rigid restrictions, as provided in this legislation.

The great body of the American people, including the Sons of the American Revolution, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the American Legion, and all the great patriotic organizations, and practically all of the civic, commercial, and political organizations of the country are earnestly supporting immigration restrictions and this bill. They voice the sovereign will of the American people and without further delay that will should be written into the law of the United States.

Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HARRIS, and others addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia. Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wonder if we can not get an agreement now to limit the debate so that we may come to a final vote on the pending bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognized the Junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARRIS. Very well; I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of discussing at length at this late hour in the debate the immigration bill—the general question. I wish merely to state my views and very briefly the reasons therefor.

On the day before yesterday we voted down the committee amendment which recognized the so-called gentlemen's agreement with Japan, and to-day we voted to place in the pending bill a provision which will exclude the Japanese altogether. Senators for whose views I have very great respect have found justification for their affirmative vote on the question just indicated in a veiled threat or implied threat contained in a letter from the Japanese ambassador to the Secretary of State. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I find no basis for my vote, which also was in the affirmative, on that question in anything that is or is not contained in the letter of the Japanese ambassador.

Whether the letter from the Japanese ambassador contains a veiled threat or an implied threat necessarily raises a question between two parties, and on that question Japan, as of right and in conformity with our method of dealing with all nations, is entitled to be heard. I am not, therefore, surprised, Mr. President, and I will not be surprised in the future, to hear the Japanese Government deny that in the letter of the Japanese ambassador there was contained any veiled or implied threat.

If that were the only justification for my vote on that important question, I should have voted in the negative. I am stating this, Mr. President, because the consideration which persuaded me to vote in the affirmative on the question to which I have referred is very largely controlling upon my vote upon the general question involved in the immigration bill before us. In other words, however we may seek to avoid the issue and however we may persuade ourselves that a false sort of diplomacy will enable us to state the issue in a way that will not disclose the true meaning of our act, I think that we must come to the conclusion that there are races of people that are not assimilable. They may be classed as wholly non-assimilable. There is no need to raise the question whether they can assimilate with us or we with them, or whether it is worth while to discuss the relative inferiority or superiority or equality of the two races. I do not desire to enter into a discussion of that question at all; but since there are races that are wholly unassimilable, it is my conviction that there are also peoples that are less assimilable than other peoples; and so, Mr. President, I should like to have a philosophy upon which I can base my position on the very important question of immigration, and I should like that philosophy to have some justification, at least in my own mind and conscience.

The question of immigration is the most important domestic question, certainly, before the Nation. Upon the determination of that question rests the future of America in a very vital way. The future ideals of America are involved in the proper solution of that question. Our industry and our agriculture can not hope to escape the effect of the immigration measure finally adopted by the Congress. Indeed, the question is one that underlies and overshadows all other questions.

I do not agree that the unrestricted immigration to which we were once accustomed presented but one evil, and therefore that immigration legislation must take into consideration the correction of one evil only. I heard the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to-day in the Senate declare that our immigration legislation was primarily based upon a consideration of American labor and the standards of American labor. That his statement is true, certainly in part, no man would deny; but I do not think that the policy of unrestricted immigration presents a single evil. It undoubtedly is true that under the policy of unrestricted immigration the total number of immigrants coming into the country reached the enormous total of 1,200,000 in one year. This mass, of course, made itself felt upon the body of American laborers, made itself felt upon the standards of American life, made itself felt upon the American home—unquestionably so. About 1880, however, and certainly as late as 1890, the character of the immigrant himself had changed, and instead of the natural infiltration of the immigrants coming to this country seeking a new and a better home, we had the unfortunate and disagreeable experience of opening our doors or of continuing to hold them open to vast numbers of immigrants who were coming not into a virgin and a growing and a young nation but into a nation already settled, which had already reached the stage of comparative manhood.

So, Mr. President, there were two evils. One was presented in the sheer number of immigrants coming, and the other in the character and in the class of the immigrants coming. About 1880, and certainly as late as 1890, as I have just said, the immigrant coming to this country established his own quarter; he established his own section; he established his own institutions; he established his own printing presses. In

fact, he solidified himself, and out of his solidity grew a form, consciously or unconsciously, of aggression; and this was precisely the cause of the restless and unhappy mood and attitude of the old or native stock.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator if I should ask him a question?

Mr. GEORGE. Not at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I have just come into the Chamber, and I heard the last sentence of the Senator, namely, that following a certain year a large number of immigrants came into the United States, they established their own quarters, they solidified themselves, and assumed rather an aggressive mood.

Mr. GEORGE. No; I did not say that.

Mr. KING. The idea of aggression at any rate was implied as I interpreted the Senator's remarks.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly; but may I state it to the Senator?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. In the solidification of the new immigration there was necessarily born, consciously or unconsciously, this spirit of aggressiveness under which the native stock—and that was the point I was emphasizing—manifested more or less restiveness and unhappiness.

Mr. KING. Then the Senator was alluding to the native stock having a spirit of aggressiveness, of resentment, rather than the immigrant?

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly so, and alluding to the cause of it, in my candid judgment.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think—perhaps it is not germane to what the Senator is discussing—that the fact that the immigrant established himself in a quarter, rather isolated himself from the mass of the American people, resulted largely because of the exclusive manifestations of the native population? We did not welcome them in the way that perhaps they thought we should welcome them, and perhaps in the way that we should have welcomed them if we sought their prompt assimilation. We crowded them into the more forbidding parts of congested districts of the United States; we gave them the lowest class of work—that which paid the least—and we made them feel that they were inferior to us. We assumed—that is the view of some, and I am inclined to think there is very much truth in it—a superiority over them; and the tendency of our manifestations was to make them herd together, to become gregarious, because they felt that we were drawing a line of cleavage between the American citizen, the native born, and the immigrant. Does not the Senator think that much of the situation is due to the failure of the people of the United States to adopt a proper attitude toward the immigrant, to provide means of Americanization, and to provide legitimate and proper means more quickly to assimilate the immigrant into the social organism?

Mr. GEORGE. I am perfectly willing to admit that in large measure what the Senator says may be true, and for the purposes of my statement here it might be admitted that it is wholly true. I do not admit that it is wholly true, but there undoubtedly is a great deal of force in what the Senator has had to say. The important point, however, Mr. President, is that, whether the fault be upon our side or upon the side of the immigrant, the fact—and the fact only that I desire to emphasize—is that precisely the condition I was attempting to describe exists.

Mr. President, neither in my discussion nor in my thought of the question do I compare one race with another, much less one nation with another. I know that America always should strive as far as possible, consistently with its own best interest, first, to give no offense to any other nation. I know that it has been our policy from the first to have a decent regard for the opinions of mankind, and I am not considering, and in my thought of the immigration question I never have considered the question of the inferiority or the superiority of my own race or of any race. We can not shut our eyes to one fact, however, and that is that after 1890 the immigrants coming into the United States did establish their quarters, did live in their own districts, did establish their own institutions, did establish their newspaper presses, and in large measure set up conditions that tended to preserve the alienage which they brought into the country.

It may be that we were very largely responsible for that. It may be that we are in very great measure responsible for that condition; but we can not remedy the character of our own people wholly, any more than we can control and remedy and reform the character of those people who come to us from other countries. So, Mr. President, just as this Nation 40 years

ago declared exclusion against Chinese immigration and Mongolian immigration, and just as to-day we have placed total exclusion against Japanese immigration, and upon the final ground that those races are nonassimilable, it seems to me that we must take into consideration the character of other peoples who come to us with reference to the very question of the ease or the difficulty with which we can assimilate them.

That, Mr. President, is the basis upon which I shall vote on this question of immigration. That is the basic reason upon which I shall act, as nearly as I can make my vote represent my convictions, my vote on this question.

Mr. President, when we think of the Chinese and the Japanese—and I refer to them not because I wish to arouse for one moment any sort of antagonistic sentiment or spirit upon the part of the Chinese or Japanese—we must think of them as industrious peoples. We must remember that the labor of these peoples builded the great Pacific railways. We must remember that they developed a great system of agriculture in the West. We must think of them as law-abiding, as men of reasonably correct habits. We must think of them, Mr. President, as children of a very ancient civilization. They possess a culture that was old while yet all of Europe was peopled by naked savages. They possess a culture and are the children of a culture that was old when the civilization and culture of Greece and of Rome were young. When Senators speak about the glorious examples that every race and every nation can present to us, and when they remind us that in the trenches with our own sons in the World War were the sons of the immigrant citizen of America, we may well ask, if we view the question courageously and fairly and candidly, What has that to do with the question? What has it to do with the question at all?

No man is more ready to admit, and no man more cheerfully admits, that from every race, indeed, from every land, have come illustrious citizens who by their achievements have made our Nation great in peace and in war. But what has that to do with the question?

Mr. President, we have in America a peculiar government, a self-government that is peculiar to the people of America. That Government has many very great excellencies, but it has no excellency that makes it fit and proper for every race of men that live upon the globe, nor can you fit every race of men, whatever may be their excellencies, to our form of government.

Washington was a fairly good American. He had a fairly good view of the character of our people at the date and on the occasion when he delivered his Farewell Address to the people of the United States, and he felicitated the people of the United States in this language:

With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles.

Washington regarded these things as fundamental, certainly as significant. He was emphasizing these things. He knew, as well as we know, that he had in his own army atheist and Protestant and Catholic, but in his calm judgment there was no such vital difference of religious principle as prevented the men in the Revolutionary Army acknowledging loyalty to the same essential political principles. There were Jews in his army and Gentiles in his army, but Washington did not regard those differences as making it impossible, or even difficult, for the men who made up the Nation at the time of the Revolution, and at the time that he was President of this Nation, to hold to the same general principles of self-government. But he undoubtedly recognized that in the slight shades of difference, so far as religion and manners and habits and matters of principle were concerned, lay the security, or a part of the strength and stability of our form of government, and that fact I think he meant to emphasize.

The attitude of Mr. Jefferson and the party of Mr. Jefferson has been referred to here to-day. No longer ago than yesterday there was quoted in this Record the language of Mr. Jefferson, and I read that language again:

While we are providing for the fortification of our country against a foreign foe, I am in favor of fortifying it against the influx of undesirable immigration.

He used the word "undesirable." That language was used, Mr. President, when this country was a very young Nation, when all the great West was yet undeveloped, when we needed people. Even in that early time the founder of the Democratic Party, Mr. Jefferson, was expressing himself about this important question, and he had the courage to express himself candidly and frankly on it. I think the big part of the whole immigration question is to be found in the candor and in the frankness with which we shall meet and face and solve our problems.

When the Chinese exclusion laws of 40 years ago were passed there were liberal Americans who said, "You affront a great people. You make for yourself trouble. You raise perplexing questions." Mr. President, I congratulate myself at least that the statesmen of 40 years ago had the courage to face the question fairly, and to-day I do not believe China regards more highly any nation on the face of this globe than she regards the United States of America.

More is to be gained by a clear and definite statement of those policies that are indispensable to national existence than by any sort of diplomatic language designed to cover up the essential principle that must control our actions. I do not see the necessity of it, Mr. President; I can not appreciate the necessity of it. It is not a question of superiority or inferiority. It is the question of the assertion of a purely national right, and there is but one question about it, What is the wise policy? How ought it to be settled?

If you go back to your newspapers of 40 years ago, you will read the language of the liberal and tolerant American giving vent to his fears because of the policy then about to be adopted with reference to China. Yet we know perfectly well how China has received and how she has accepted what we regarded as a necessary policy on our part. Precisely the same thing will occur in the case of Japan, I think, because she is a great nation, because we make no question of superiority or inferiority, but because we insist upon a right that is purely national, purely domestic, and because we have the courage and the candor and the frankness to say that we are doing it upon the ground that—

East is east and west is west,  
And never the twain shall meet.

There is a good deal more history in that than poetry. There is no occasion for excitement about it, but there is less occasion for apology about it. I believe, and I believe it has been true, so far as our actions in the past with reference to the Chinese and the yellow races in general are concerned, that Japan will recognize the full wisdom of our course; but I know that there can never be a question concerning anything but the wisdom of our course.

Therefore, Mr. President, I took occasion to say, and I take occasion to repeat, that I could not vote on the proposition to exclude the Japanese from this country upon the ground that in a message or letter of the Japanese ambassador I had found a veiled or implied threat.

I know that that raises a question between two people, and on that question both are entitled to be heard, but I vote on the broad ground that we are settling a domestic question, a vitally necessary and indispensable question, and because we shall fairly and candidly settle it upon the basis that two races are not assimilable, that we are dealing with a question which only this Nation has the right to decide.

So I think that in determining the broader question involved in this immigration measure before us we must of necessity keep in mind the ease or difficulty with which separate races and the nationals of other nations can be assimilated, can be absorbed, without injury to them or to us, if we want to consider their interests, but certainly without injury to us.

I recognize perfectly well, so far as I am concerned, that some races are more easily assimilable, some races and some peoples are more easily absorbable into our body politic, and without injury to us. If I did not recognize that I would not vote for any measure that seemed to me to discriminate against any nation. I do not like the word "discriminate," because it has no proper place in my discussion of the immigration question. I know that the question is a big one, and it is so big that any Senator has perfect justification for shades of view upon the bill and the important question presented in the bill before the Senate. But, so far as I am concerned, it does seem to me that, inasmuch as I can recognize that certain races are nonassimilable, I have no difficulty in realizing that the nationals from certain nations or certain peoples are less easily assimilable than those from others.

I believe in the principle contained in the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. I believe very thoroughly in that principle. I do not believe in that principle because I think that by the adoption of it I shall give no offense to any other nation. If I mean and intend no offense, I do not fear the giving of offense, and I have tried to make it perfectly plain that in my thinking on the question of immigration I do not take into consideration so much the question of inferiority or of superiority, or even of equality of races or of nations.

The principle involved in the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, as I understand it, is this,

that after a date fixed, Congress shall fix the total of immigration to be admitted in any one year, and shall apportion that total to the various nations in exact accordance with their proportionate representation in the whole population of the United States at the present time, with certain exceptions, of course, of those whom the Senator himself has pointed out.

I believe that amendment is a good amendment and is a wise amendment, because I believe that the amendment will in actual application permit to come into the United States a larger number of easily assimilable people and a smaller number, relatively a very small number, of those people more difficult of absorption or assimilation.

Therefore, I believe that the principle stated in the amendment is sound. It can not give any offense even to the nations who have a feeling upon the question of emigration. There is but one possible objection to it and that objection is this: As yet the basis to be used in the Senator's amendment has not been fixed; at least it is not officially declared. I think it is highly desirable that we should finally fix our immigration policy; in other words, I can not think we should longer enact a law which in its very nature expires by its own terms or is understood at the time of its adoption to have only temporary application.

Since the basis on which the quota is to be applied is now not definitely fixed and determined, or, at least, officially determined, I do not like the idea of passing an immigration law and leaving it open for future action by the Congress—that is, in the terms of the law itself inviting action by the Congress. Of course, I recognize that the Congress can at any time in the future, and will from time to time in the future, I have no doubt, deal with the great question of immigration. At the same time, I believe it highly desirable at this time that we settle upon a fixed policy of immigration, and that we put it in effect as speedily as possible.

Now, my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], has an amendment pending which will exclude for a fixed period all immigration. I must say very candidly that I do not see the necessity of that amendment. I will vote with my colleague on it because he sees the necessity of it, but I myself do not recognize the necessity of total exclusion of all immigration even for a stated or a given number of years.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. HARRIS. It is very kind of my colleague to vote for my amendment when he does not see the necessity of it, but he does not state my amendment as it is. We define an immigrant and make certain exceptions—for instance, a Government official, his family and attendants, aliens visiting the United States temporarily, tourists for business, study, or pleasure, an alien in continued transit through the United States, children of foreigners, children of foreign-born American citizens—the children being under 18 years of age—and a father and mother who are over 55 years of age. So far as I am concerned, that lets in more than I would like to have come in. I would really like to limit it more than that.

Mr. GEORGE. I recognize what my colleague says is, of course, true, that his amendment does contain certain exceptions, but I was about to say that I do not see the necessity at this time of the amendment. There might have been great necessity for such an amendment immediately following the World War. We anticipated that there would probably be a larger number of immigrants coming into the country than had hitherto come in during any given period. But my real objection, if I have a real objection to my colleague's amendment, is this: It also leaves open the final determination, or the determination of what we must hope to be a relatively final solution, of the whole question of immigration. I think it ought to be settled.

I have often heard Senators give expression about the will of the people and the speedy enactment into law of the will of the people. If that is a valid consideration, if it is one that must be given force and effect by an American Congress—and, of course, it has its weight—I do not believe there can be much doubt but that the people of the United States are as nearly unanimous upon the question as they can be upon any great question which offers so much justification for honest difference of opinion and view. I believe that they favor restriction, and very rigid restriction, but I think they also favor legislation in its nature and character permanent, using the word in its relative sense.

Therefore, I think, as highly desirable as my colleague's amendment may have been just after the conclusion of the World War or as it may be now for certain purposes, that it still leaves open the big question of immigration, leaves it for

the future consideration of Congress, and it seems to me that we ought to settle upon a definite policy. It seems to me that we are able to settle upon a definite policy now.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt my colleague? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to his colleague?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.  
Mr. HARRIS. I wonder if my colleague does not agree with me that if we prohibit immigration for five years we can then be in a position to settle the question better than at this time, because the war and the after-war conditions will be gone.

Mr. GEORGE. Possibly so. I should hope so. I am giving to my colleague the benefit of every doubt upon the question. I am going to vote with him on his amendment, but I am expressing my views upon the question. I am saying that his amendment has merit and it has at least the merit, when offered by him, to induce me to give it my support.

With that I pass merely to a final statement, and that is the statement with reference to the quota. I have no difficulty in supporting the substitute offered by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I believe it, perhaps, to be the wise policy to adopt in the matter. I believe that we should take the census of 1890, not because the census of 1890 discriminates against any people or discriminates in favor of any nation, but because, as I believe, the census of 1890 will approximate most nearly to the basis of the computation fixed in the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED].

I do not take his amendment nor the census of 1890 upon any reason other than this: Both the census of 1890 and the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania seem to me to admit the largest number of assimilable, wholly assimilable, easily assimilable, races into the United States, and to exclude those races or the people from those nations that are with most difficulty absorbed into our life without injury to us. In making this final statement permit me to repeat that the whole question is one of such broadness and one of such great importance as to admit of very great variety of opinion and of marked and strong differences of view about it. But it does seem to me in the discussion of the question that we should discuss it candidly and frankly, without regard to the question of inferiority or superiority or equality of races that so often finds its way into a discussion of the immigration question.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I submit the unanimous-consent agreement which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The reading clerk read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that after the hour of 2 o'clock p. m., on the calendar day of April 17, 1924, debate shall be limited upon the bill (S. 2576) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes, so that no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 10 minutes upon the bill, or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed agreement?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have taken no time in the discussion of the bill and I have no present intention of doing so. It seems to me the Senate is making progress, and because the Senate regards the bill as of very great importance I do not think the Senator should ask for a cloture rule at this time. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah objects.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I then ask unanimous consent that when the Senate shall conclude its business to-day it will take a recess until noon to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I do not intend to object to the Senator's request, but I desire to ask for the information of the Senate whether he has given consideration to the matter of holding night sessions upon the bill? It is a measure very important and other bills are crowding for consideration. It seems to me the Senate might well devote some time in the evening to the pending bill. Has the Senator considered that matter?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I agree with the Senator from Ohio, but I have been hoping that we may have a limitation of debate. I had understood when I offered the consent agreement at this time that there would be no objection to it, but apparently I had not reconnoitered my ground sufficiently. If we can not agree to limit debate, we shall have to hold a night session either to-night or to-morrow.

Mr. WILLIS. I hope the Senator will persist in that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not object, but I suggest to the Senator that he give notice if the bill is not concluded to-morrow we shall have a session to-morrow night. That will give everyone notice and perhaps hurry the measure along.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have been hoping that we would run rather late this afternoon and continue the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania that when the Senate shall have concluded its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. REED of Missouri obtained the floor.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I assure the Senator from Pennsylvania that from all I can learn there will be no difficulty in having the pending bill disposed of by day after to-morrow. That is the reason why I objected to cloture.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] suggested cloture 10 days ago. I then said that I thought the bill too important to ask it. I myself suggested cloture on Monday. I was then told that four Senators had indicated their desire to speak, and that until they had finished I had best withhold the request. I was told a little while ago that all objection had been withdrawn. That is the reason I submitted the request, but I very much hope that the Senate will see fit to limit debate within the next day or two.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think probably the Senator from Pennsylvania was informed subsequently to the conversation that I had with him by some Senator that I had withdrawn my objection to a limitation of debate at this time. After some opportunity shall have been afforded to discuss amendments which may have been offered from the floor and that are not in order now I shall be perfectly willing to limit debate; but it would be a very unusual proceeding in the Senate to limit debate before the committee amendments have been disposed of and before amendments offered upon the floor are in order.

If the Senator from Pennsylvania will be patient, and will give us merely a reasonable time to discuss amendments which may be offered upon the floor—and on to-morrow, I think, we shall get to that order—so far as I am concerned, I shall be perfectly willing to agree to a time to vote.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I understood that that was the feeling of the Senator from North Carolina, and it was not until I had received the information that he felt an agreement would be in order now that I ventured to make the suggestion which I have made.

Mr. SIMMONS. That was an entire mistake, Mr. President. As I said to the Senator from Pennsylvania this morning, I will not consent to a limitation upon debate until some opportunity shall have been given to discuss amendments which are offered to the bill from the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for just a moment in order that I may make a personal explanation?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] has stated, I have been trying to get action on the immigration bill for some time. I misunderstood the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] in discussing the question with him. I have been waiting here to hear the Senator's speech for two or three days, and he has been anxious to get the floor. He told me, as I stated this morning, that he would wait until the amendments came up in the regular order on the bill; and I understood that he had withdrawn his objection to considering amendments under the 10-minute rule; and I so stated to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I should like to give notice now that if the immigration bill shall not have been disposed of by to-morrow afternoon, I shall ask the Senate to remain in session to-morrow night in order to continue its consideration.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, at this late hour in the discussion of the bill, with full knowledge that probably every Senator has made up his mind on the subject, and with but few Members of the Senate in the Chamber, I do not

presume to think that I shall change a single vote, or that my remarks will have any other present effect than to register my own views regarding this character of legislation. I shall try to do that briefly.

There has been introduced into the bill a principle in which I firmly believe and which I advocated on the floor some years ago, and that is the principle that immigrants shall be examined, their character ascertained, and their fitness for residence or citizenship in the United States determined by some board representing this country. I recognize the fact, as we all have recognized the truth, that there are in every country undesirables who are no credit to their native land and who would be of no advantage to this country. By the establishment of such a tribunal every undesirable could be excluded, except a very small percentage who might succeed in deceiving some American tribunal appointed to pass upon their fitness for citizenship. So that, with that provision in the bill and assuming that it will be fairly enforced, we will be protected against an influx of people who are, to use the oft-repeated expression, nonassimilable; and, with that principle in the bill, all that is left is to restrict the number of people coming to the United States who will make good citizens after arrival. Assuming that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania to which I have just referred shall become a part of the measure, the bill ought to be entitled "a proposal to bar from the United States all human beings who will make good citizens of the United States if they exceed the number of 160,000." The proposition stated in that way is an absurdity, because we are denying to ourselves the addition of a population that will amalgamate with our so-called native population and will make good and valuable citizens of the country.

Every argument as to the undesirability of races is removed; every argument as to the undesirability of certain citizens of different nations is removed the moment we establish tribunals judicially to examine and pass upon the qualifications of the individual. So that we are brought here face to face with the naked proposition of excluding people who will make good citizens and who our own tribunals have declared will make good citizens. I repeat, that is the last word in know-nothingism, and I use the term "know-nothingism" in the political sense in which it was employed when know-nothingism raised its ugly, vicious, and ignorant head in the United States, with the result that one political party went out of business.

There can be but one justification for a restriction upon immigration, and that is that the individual coming here is not fit to live here after he gets here. But when we have set up our own tribunals and have judicially examined into the character of the applicant and have determined that he is fit to live here after he gets here, and then exclude him, we are doing a very absurd if not a very wicked thing.

Mr. President, every human being who is capable of supporting himself and who is capable of making and who will make a good citizen of the United States is an addition to the moral, the intellectual, the physical, and the financial assets of the United States. The fact that a man happened to be born on the other side of the red line of the map does not make his presence here any less valuable than that of a man who happened to be born on this side of the line if the two men are equal in character and equal in their love for this country. It is as absurd to exclude from this country a good man who will make a good citizen as it would be to expel a good man who is also equally a good citizen.

I do not expect to stop this craze; I do not expect to arrest this movement; but I say that it is one of the narrowest and most contemptible movements that ever cursed the American people. Here are two of God's children. One of them happened to be born under the flag of some European monarch, but we take him and judicially examine him.

We find that he wants to leave that monarch's rule because he loves liberty. We find that he is intelligent. We find that he is attached to American institutions. We find that he wants to move into a land where he and his children may enjoy the blessings of liberty, and we say to that human being, "You shall not enter here. It is true when you come you are well intentioned toward our Government; it is true you will support yourself; it is true you will add to the wealth of this country; it is true you are of such a character that you and your children can be amalgamated into and assimilated with the present population of the United States; and yet, because you happen to have been born under another flag than ours, you shall not enter these holy precincts of the United States. When you come as an adult, you are worth actually in the market, as an asset to the country, a large amount of money."

To refuse admission to this country of men who have been determined to be of the character I have referred to is as absurd as it would be for the president of a bank to refuse gold at his counter, and it is as narrow as the proscriptive spirit that has run through the ages and has cursed the world.

More than that, the absurdity is increased by the fact that many men who are supporting this bill have recently been talking about democratizing the world, of carrying the benefits of our civilization elsewhere for the benefit of the world, of uniting with the other nations of the world to set up a sort of world tribunal or world government, and doing this for the benefit of other nations and other races whom they in turn say can not be democratized enough to become American citizens when they come here swearing by the Almighty God in whom they believe that their purpose is to become good American citizens, and when we judicially determine that they are capable of that achievement and that that is the purpose of their hearts and the intention of their souls.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], to whom I have listened with profound respect the few times that he has favored us with his views, and for whose mastery of logic and honesty of purpose I have the highest regard, said in the closing part of his speech that this was not a question of race superiority at all, but that that question could be disregarded.

Mr. President, it can not be disregarded. It is the very essence of this whole question; but I claim that it will be eliminated from the question if we adopt that provision of the bill which proposes to set up tribunals to determine the fitness of the prospective citizen, for, under that, if an individual is of such race or such blood or such character that he can not be assimilated into the white population of the United States and become a part of the great spirit of America, then he could be and would be properly rejected by any such tribunal.

Mr. President, I have said that this spirit of proscription and narrowness has come down through the ages. There has not been a race of men who have ever established themselves upon this earth but have assumed that they were God's chosen children. They have set up barriers against the stranger. In the savage days they imprisoned him or slaughtered him if he entered within their domains; and just in proportion as they adhered to that narrow policy they have circumscribed their own well-being and limited their own development; and just in proportion as nations have recognized the fact that they are only one of the great family of nations, just in proportion as they have generously opened their doors to the peoples of other countries, have nations grown into magnitude and power.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do.

Mr. CARAWAY. I was rather impressed until the Senator made this speech that he was against the league; that he thought we ought to live exclusively by ourselves.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator has been properly impressed. The difference, perhaps, between the Senator's view and mine is this: He thinks we ought to go over into another man's country and interfere over there, but that we should stop that man from coming here when he wants to come voluntarily and join us. We just differ on that.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I ask the Senator another question? Then I presume the difference is this: If the Senator sees a row in the street, he wants to bring it into his own home and have it in his parlor instead of having it out there?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, no; but if I thought enough of a man to go out and interfere in his row in the street and hunt a chance to get into it and try to set myself up to boss him over there I would think that probably he was a good enough fellow, if he came here and asked the privilege of living in America, to let him come.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I interrupt the Senator again?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. If I thought a man was such a bad man that I was not willing to do anything for him in Europe, I would not want to incorporate him in with my own people.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That may be the Senator's view. I do not think they are too bad to do anything for them. I never have taken that view. What I have said is that they are not good enough to set up a government in which we will be a minority, and by their votes, as citizens of other countries, to control us.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. Has the Senator no confidence in them as long as they live beyond the seas, but is he perfectly willing

to incorporate them with our own people and let them control us here at home?

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator, as usual, discusses a question that is as foreign to the question I am discussing as the fall of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Mr. CARAWAY. At least—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Now, wait a minute, until I answer the Senator. I have said that where there are governments in Europe, monarchies and republics, loyal unto themselves and their people loyal unto themselves, I was unwilling to enter into a super world government in which we would be a minority party, and those people, who may be our enemies, and who may have many interests opposed to us, would control the policy of America by their votes. That is a very different proposition than denying admission to this country to an individual of any other nation who comes here and says: "I want to join your country. I want to swear allegiance to your flag. I am willing to live by your rules and die by your rules." If the Senator can not see that distinction, it is because he has put aside his usually very acute intellect for the purpose of merely trying to nag me, which is his long suit in life, and if he ever lost that he would die.

Now, I proceed.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I suggest to the Senator that I put in pretty nearly half my time defending the Senator instead of nagging him?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Why, certainly; and when the Senator is doing that, that is what gives him his good standing in this body. Otherwise, the Senator makes mistakes.

Now, let me proceed. I say that in one breath people are preaching here world love and the universal brotherhood of man; that there should be a super world government; that we should join in it; that we should go out democratizing the world; and then the same gentlemen refuse to permit a lover of liberty, a lover of democracy, to come here and swear allegiance to our flag. It, however, is a minor incident in what I am saying, and I refer to it only to impress the absurdity of this whole movement.

I was saying, Mr. President, when I was interrupted, that you can take the history of the nations of this world, and the only nations that have made great progress are the nations that have been reasonably liberal in the matter of admitting the peoples of other countries within their own domain. The nation which built a Chinese wall about itself limited its opportunities, circumscribed its career, and arrested its march of progress. Those nations that are composed of the mixed bloods of many peoples are the nations that have controlled this world from the very first.

Rome was composed of many peoples and of many bloods.

France is composed of many stocks. She first took her great place in the world after the Franks had swept down from the forests of Germany and established themselves as a part of the people of ancient Gaul.

Great Britain, which boasts of her lineage, must admit her admixture with the Romans, with the Norsemen, with the Angles and the Saxons who came in from Germany and grafted themselves upon the original stock of the British Isles.

Germany herself is composed of many different tribes and many different peoples.

Austria in like manner was composed of many peoples.

It is in the admixture, the flux of humanity passing back and forth, that nations get their virility and their life and their energy, and the thing that has given to the American citizen his peculiar dominance in the world—for with all his shortcomings, I regard him as the most dominant character in the world—is the fact that he is the product of the admixture of many races.

So this policy of exclusion, which began originally by killing every man who was a stranger in the land, then gradually broadened itself until they were admitted in some countries with generosity—this policy of exclusion has been a part of our national history. This movement that we have in the Senate to-day is as old as America. It seems to me that the first individual who set his foot on the soil of America turned around and looked across the sea and said to all his own brethren he had left behind, "None of you at all can come over here. I am the native-born American citizen." That is rather an extreme statement, but it illustrates a general situation.

Some Englishman came over here, then some Englishmen were sent over here; then some Irishmen came over here, and the English told the Irish they were not fit to settle here. Then some Germans came over and some Dutch came over, and away back, immediately succeeding the Revolution, we had this same struggle.

There has been talk here to-day about these foreigners coming here and settling in communities. They have done it from the first. There is no change in that. Go over to Pennsylvania. It appears from a document which was brought to me, and which I put in the Record in the speech I made on this matter before, that so great a man as Benjamin Franklin, away back in his day, warned the people that this country was going to be turned into a European province, for over in Pennsylvania they actually transacted the business in the German language, and they actually used it in their courts. The Germans were there in such dominant numbers that he came to believe that a foreign principality was to be established on our soil, and when I remember that Benjamin Franklin made that mistake, with all his wisdom, I do not wonder that the statesmen of this day naturally will fall into error.

Yet what happened in Pennsylvania? What occurred with reference to this population that herded together so that they used their own native language instead of using the American language? Is there any better State than Pennsylvania? Are there any better people than the Pennsylvanians? Are they a discredit to our Nation? Are they an asset to us in peace? Are they a source of strength to us in time of war? Have they added to the sum total of the moral standing and intellectual power of the people of the United States? Yet these people herded at that time.

When the Irish first came here they came very largely, the great influx after the famine days. They were poor, they were ragged, they came in the steerage of ships. They were denounced. The highbrows met in indignation in all parts of the country.

The gentleman with proscriptive soul was there. He declared the Irish would ruin this country, because, he said, they were ignorant; and they were ignorant, largely ignorant because a tyrannical government has closed their schools and persecuted their schoolmasters and had closed the door of learning in their face. They were poor. Poverty and want had put its white finger upon them and reduced them to a condition of absolute starvation. They came here and herded together. They slept in shanties. Some of them lived in the most impoverished and desperate condition for many years. Yet who is it to-day who dares in America denounce a man of Irish lineage? They are numbered among our orators, our poets, our statesmen. The sons of those immigrants have taken their place proudly with the rest of the people.

Then the German came, and the German was abused. He herded. There are German colonies all over the United States, in which gradually the language disappears, gradually the racial characteristics become less and less. They melt into the great community. But they have herded, just as we hear the cry of herding now. Yet I venture to say, in the face of that spirit which still exists succeeding the war, when every effort was made to fan the hatred of this country for that race because we were at war with their country, that the German citizen has contributed his full share to the greatness of America.

I see upon this map the great number of people coming from Austria is pictured as a warning. I remember very well when they came from Austria—from a Province of Austria, from Bohemia. They came here in the steerage. They rode West in immigrant trains. They came off the cars with the odor of the filthy passage they had been compelled to endure. Few of them had any money. They settled in colonies. I saw them as they walked with their wooden shoes on the depot platform, the old women carrying feather beds upon their backs, and cooking utensils, the men wearing leather waistcoats that had been handed down, it appeared to me, from past generations. They went out in the country and settled and lived in sod houses. They were regarded as a scourge. All of the alarmists were there; all of these native-born American citizens were there to denounce the poor Bohemian. Yet I lived to see the sons and daughters of those people enter the public schools, and I entered with them. I found that about as hard a competitor as I had to meet in my classes was a Bohemian boy or girl. The men grew into stalwart Americans, and the girls were as beautiful as any of the so-called American aristocrats whose "granddaddy" happened to have come here, instead of the father.

I have witnessed the proscriptive movements. I have seen the man who says, "I am better than thou art," the fellow who thinks that the country would suffer if anybody was in any manner different from him. Yet 99 times out of 100 the man of that sort is the man who lacks the breadth of judgment and the charity to recognize the fact that the peoples of all countries and of all lands have their good and their bad; that they have their geniuses and have their sloths; that they have

their patriots and have their traitors. But in the great mass of the white race of Europe you find splendid men and splendid women who, given a decent opportunity of life, will make good American citizens—the great mass of them.

In our Fourth of July days we used to think that courage was the peculiar heritage of the American people; but the late war demonstrated to us and demonstrated to the world that the peoples of Europe can stand and fight and die as valiantly, I will say—almost as valiantly, at least—as can our own sons.

We used to think that we knew all there was in civilization. Yet their schools of art and their wonderful achievements in music answer back to us that we have much to learn from the Old World.

We used to think that we were the great inventive race of the world. Yet when we came into contact with the arts of invention that were employed in the late war by European nations, we learned that there were other brains that could think, and that there were other hands that were cunning. When we survey the field of scientific achievement, we must sit at the feet of the savants of Europe quite as often as they sit at our feet.

When we look at the march of progress that has gone on in this world, we are bound, if our vision be not clouded, to have regard for the fact that while we have been cultivating education here in point of literacy we are far below every European state. Sweden leads the list in literacy, closely followed by Germany, and in several European countries we find that there is a lower degree of ignorance than there is in the United States among our own native-born population.

Moreover, when we examine the figures—and I put them all in the RECORD when this debate was on before—we find the startling fact that the citizens of foreign countries send a greater percentage of their children to school than do the native born American citizens.

The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] has offered an amendment to exclude all immigrants for five years. I do not want to speak disrespectfully of Georgia, and I do not; it is a great State, with a great history; but in point of literacy, the white population of Georgia is far below the white population of Norway, or of Sweden, or of Denmark, or of Germany, or of Holland, or of Switzerland.

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. Of course, I know the Senator means no disrespect to my State. He said he did not.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I think it is a wonderful State.

Mr. GEORGE. What I want to ask the Senator is this, is not the presence there of a different race, in very large numbers—

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am speaking of the white population.

Mr. GEORGE. I know; but has not the other race something to do with that condition?

Mr. REED of Missouri. With dragging down the white?

Mr. GEORGE. Is there not some relation between the two?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not know. The Senator would have to answer that for himself. I say this, I think when we consider conditions in the Southern States—and in that I will include my own State, for we are semisouthern, at least—I think we will agree that that part of the country suffered so from the Civil War that in the recovery from the economic conditions those States were retarded in the matter of education; but there is the condition, without criticism. I am simply saying that it is proposed to exclude the people of other lands, to exclude a man because of his race. We should exclude him because of his character, but not because of his race. If his character is bad, let those tribunals find it out and close the door in his face, but if his character is good let the door swing open. When I say his character is good, I mean when his character for citizenship is good.

When did we get this way? I picked up a paper this morning and read the statement that a Russian woman had solved the riddle of the ages which from the days of Hippocrates down to this hour has puzzled all of the students of disease and medicine. She had discovered a remedy for leprosy. I do not know, but she is quite as likely to discover it as though she had not happened to have been born in Russia.

We talk about the wonders of radium. A French woman solved that problem. So I might, if I wanted to, stand here until to-morrow morning reciting the achievements of other races. You propose to say to people of that kind, "keep out," and you propose to say it based upon a fallacy which I propose to expose in a moment. Let me dwell on this a moment. There sits upon the Supreme Court bench of these United

States a man who would be excluded by the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Georgia—

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think the Senator means to bring me in, because I did not offer the amendment.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I meant the senior Senator from Georgia. I misstated myself, but I understood the Senator to approve it, and I was sorry to hear him say it, for there is nothing unkindly in my remarks, as the Senator knows.

There sits upon the Supreme Court bench of the United States a man who once honored this Chamber by his genius and his intelligence, who was born outside of the United States—born in England. There sat here nearly 30 years a great Senator who landed in this country when he was 8 years of age with one silver dollar in his pocket, the late Knute Nelson, the Norwegian. Was there ever a better American citizen, one who loved his country more?

There sit in this Chamber to-day two or three or four men who I understand were born in other countries. I see the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. JOHNSON] here. I have traveled all over that great State of his. If we would take the Swedes and the Norwegians and the Danes out of Minnesota we would almost depopulate it, and most of them came there in my lifetime. As we go over that State we find its farms are beautiful; we find its people largely with names that indicate they are of Scandinavian origin. What did those people do when they got here? They went up there and took a piece of prairie that was not doing anybody on earth any good; was not even a pasture for buffalo any more, for the buffalo were not there.

They plowed that sod, they planted it and raised crops. They built habitations and barns. They reared children and established schools and erected churches. They became a part of the great body politic of the United States, and they have been just as good citizens as some of those people whose grandfathers happened to come here instead of the individuals themselves coming. Would we add to our wealth if we obliterated the greater part of Minnesota? Why, somebody will say they went in crowds. They did. We find a large percentage of the population there of Scandinavian origin. Naturally when one man goes from a country and locates he writes home to tell his brethren about it, and they come and write to their brethren, and we thus get a certain concentration of people.

Where did this narrow spirit of proscription come from? This used to be the land of the free and the home of the brave. It used to be taught that here was a habitation for the oppressed of the earth. We remember that along the lines of Lexington, at Concord, at Valley Forge, at Yorktown, there stood many races of men, speaking many languages. I think there were 36 different languages spoken in New York before the Revolution. They had many religions. Some of them did not have any religion. They all had the religion of liberty in their hearts, their divine fires of God Almighty planted in the hearts of men, the divine fires of liberty burning there. They helped to establish and make this country. They have stood on the field of every battle that has been fought, and they have stood in the arks of peace, in the avocations of civic life, side by side with the man whose grandfather came from the same country only a little while before, and they have made good.

Where is your menace? In what respect have they destroyed us? Were they traitors during the recent war? Are they any worse in morals than the so-called native-born American citizen? Are they any lower in point of education, the second generation, the generation first born here? I say they are not, and the statistics prove it.

Native-born American citizens? How did you happen to be born here? Some of our ancestors were sent over here as indentured servants. Some of our ancestors came here as prisoners. Some of our ancestors came here to escape religious persecution. Many of our ancestors, the great majority of them, came to escape the hard conditions of life in Europe. As soon as a man lands here he turns around and wants to slam the door in the face of somebody else just as good a man as he is, and he calls that Americanism.

Now, we have an argument here that there are certain races of men in which there is a very large percentage of those who are undesirable, and that those undesirables ought to be kept out. I agree to the proposition of keeping out every undesirable. When we establish these boards, if they are properly administered, we can afford to take down all of the doors and let as many come in as come here equipped for American citizenship. But as I look at the diagram on the wall to which I have invited attention I take it that it is intended to demonstrate that immigration from the United Kingdom was all right when it was very large in proportion to the total of the immigrants,

and that it was all right to come from Germany in large numbers; but that the trouble is there has been a diminution of the people from the United Kingdom and from Germany and a larger number of people proportionately have come from the other countries. Singularly enough, the map, which must be a very bungling affair, does not show anything about the menace of immigration that has come from Scandinavia. They are put in with "all others."

What made this change in immigration? Economic conditions in Europe were such that the people of the United Kingdom did not much care to move. Economic conditions in Germany were such that the people of Germany did not care to emigrate in later years. Of course, they have been shut out since the war, and therefore the figures are utterly deceiving, utterly deceptive. Now reverse the economic conditions and you will reverse immigration. There is not a man in this Chamber who does not know that if we were to open the doors to-morrow and say to every German who wants to come to this country and can qualify, "The doors are open," that we would have a large immigration from Germany. So that if it is desirable you can get it by letting them come in.

Let us have no more of this hocus-pocus and false pretense. If you want to keep a German out, say so; but do not put up a map here indicating to me that he was desirable and is desirable, and that there are so few of them coming that that is one reason why we are putting this bill through. You know and I know that with the present economic conditions in Germany, if you will open the doors you will have plenty of immigrants from Germany. Moreover, if we are to judge anything by what we hear of economic conditions in the British Isles, we would have a large increase in immigration from there. We would have a large increase, undoubtedly, from all of the northern countries of Europe, because the applications that have come and the desire to come in from those countries already indicate it.

What about Austria? Is Austria to be condemned? Of course, I am not speaking of present little Austria. Are not the Austrians capable of good citizenship? Among them were the Bohemian, the Czechoslovakian, and different peoples from those smaller countries. Open your doors and see if they do not come. Take off your limitations, but put up your tribunals and let your tribunals say if a man is not fit for citizenship that he can not come in, no matter in what country he was born. That is the proper solution.

Now, I want to give you a little final thought on this that may be popular or may not. When I believe a thing I say it, regardless of popularity. You want to solve the farmers' problem, do you? If you had two or three million more people in this country, two or three million more mouths to feed here at home, you would have mighty little surplus sent abroad, and the farmers' problem would be largely solved.

Moreover, the farmer would be able to get some labor upon his farm at prices which he could afford to pay. The farmer has been undergoing this sort of an experience: The automobile came along and practically destroyed one branch of his industry—the rearing of horses and mules. Practically that has ceased as an industry. Those animals used to eat great quantities of farm products. To-day that avenue of consumption is largely closed. Bring over some human beings to this country. Let them go onto farms, as they will largely go on the farms; let them work for moderate wages, so that the farmer can afford to live. After a while they will begin to get their feet under them and they will, perhaps, become the owners of farms. In the meantime, however, there will have been an increased consumption in the United States, and it will be found at the end of a reasonable period of time that the farm problem will have been largely solved by the creation of a market at home that could consume that much of the products which the farmers raised and save them from the disability of selling their surplus on the broken market of Europe.

It is worth while to think a little about these matters; it is worth while for you men of the South to ask yourselves the question whether you do not need a larger white population in the South. Some question ought to be asked as to what is to solve your labor problem in the South. I do not pretend to instruct you; I do not pretend to say what you ought to do. You know that section better than I know it, and one principle that I have held to is that States ought to be allowed to run their own business, because the people of the State know the business of the State better than the people of the other States know it.

I do know, however, to-day the American farmer has to pay wages that are prohibitive upon his farming industry, as my friend from Minnesota [Mr. JOHNSON], I think, will bear me out.

Mr. President, this movement is but a part of a general swing. We are going to exclude everybody; we are going to keep this country just for ourselves, we think; but we are simply denying ourselves the wealth of the world, the splendid men and women who want to come to this country and live under our flag and become a part of this great people. You may do it; you doubtless will do it.

As for myself, I would restrict the immigration simply by determining that the individual was capable of becoming and intended to become a good American citizen; that he was capable of amalgamation into our population and into our civilization; that he was well adapted to become a thorough-going American citizen. Having done that, I would say to all who desire to come, "The doors are open, and we welcome you." So we shall develop our own country; we shall increase its wealth, its prestige, its power. There will come from other lands men with the genius of painters and artists, men with a capacity for hard work, men and women with a gift for invention and music; and all the adornments and all the utilities of life they will bring over in their brains and in their hearts, just as our fathers brought similar qualities when they entered this land. Our country will become greater and better because of the addition of that kind of people. This movement may be popular to-day, but it is a narrow movement; it is a proscriptive movement, and in a sense it is a destructive movement.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask leave to perfect the pending amendment by the elisions and additions which are shown on the copy which I send to the desk. I ask that the Secretary read the amendment, as I desire to perfect it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania modifies and perfects the amendment which is now pending. The Secretary will read the amendment as proposed to be modified.

The READING CLERK. The amendment as proposed to be modified reads as follows:

At the end of section 8 insert the following:

"On or before March 4, 1926, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor shall jointly make an estimate showing as nearly as may be the several national origins of the persons who in 1920 comprised the whole population of continental United States, excepting the descendants of such persons as were involuntary immigrants into the territory now included therein. In the preparation of such estimate the said officers are authorized to call for information and expert assistance from the Bureau of the Census, and to receive and utilize any information that may be available from other sources.

"After July 1, 1927, the maximum total number of immigrants that shall be admitted into the United States in each fiscal year shall, unless the Congress shall in the interim provide otherwise, be 150,000, and the annual quota of each nationality shall bear the same ratio to said maximum total number of immigrants as the number of inhabitants of the United States having that national origin shall bear to the whole number of inhabitants other than the descendants of involuntary immigrants. On or before April 1, 1927, said officials shall jointly proclaim and make known the quotas of each nationality, determined as aforesaid, and thereafter the said quotas shall continue with the same effect as if specifically stated herein, and shall be subject to correction and readjustment only if it shall be made to appear, to the satisfaction of said officials, that an error of fact has occurred in said estimate or in said proclamation."

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the changes that have been made in this amendment consist in postponing the date for the effective application of the method by one year, making it July 1, 1927, instead of July 1, 1926. Another change in date extends the time for the commission, consisting of three Cabinet officers, to make their report to March 4, 1926, the purpose of that being, in case there should be a change in the administration, to give the new officials ample time to make their report to the Congress. I may say that these changes have been drafted after a conference with the Senator from Mississippi and other Senators on the other side of the aisle, and I understand that with these changes the amendment is now generally acceptable.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HARRISON. On yesterday, or the day before yesterday I believe it was, when the Senator offered his amendment, it carried with it the provision that in 1926 the method proposed in his amendment should apply. The amendment has now been very materially changed, and in view of the modification of the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, I

shall withdraw the substitute which I offered, with the expectation of offering the amendment, which I reserved the right to offer when we began the consideration of this bill, to change the basis of the quota from the census of 1910 to the census of 1890.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi withdraws the substitute for the amendment which is now pending.

Mr. WILLIS. May I interrupt the Senator—

Mr. HARRISON. May I say further, before the Senator proceeds, that under the unanimous-consent agreement the vote will come first on the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, and then I understand the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] desires that in lieu of 2 per cent, as provided by the committee amendment, he may offer an amendment fixing the percentage at 1 per cent on the basis of the census of 1910.

Mr. WILLIS. If I may interrupt the Senator there, it will not be necessary formally to present the amendment, although it has been pending for some time, because the vote, as I understand, under the agreement now reached, will come first upon the committee amendment in line 10, on page 12, and those who, like myself, favor the 1 per cent provision need only vote against the committee amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Then, when that question is out of the way—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to remind the Senator from Ohio that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania is the pending amendment.

Mr. WILLIS. I understand that, and I am quite agreeable to that; but after that amendment, as modified, shall have been disposed of, then the question will recur—and if I am mistaken about that I hope I will be corrected by the Chair—upon agreeing to the committee amendment in line 10, on page 12, which will raise the question that I am specifically interested in, namely, to adopt an amendment providing that the quota shall be 1 per cent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair understands, that is the situation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am going to object to the unanimous-consent request. The logical place for the amendment which I have offered—and I think it was the first amendment offered—is before any of the other amendments which have been presented. As I understand, the agreement proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania would allow a vote on practically every other amendment before voting on my amendment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia has not caught the drift of what I said. I am not asking for any unanimous-consent agreement whatever, and I believe the Senators who have in mind a vote on the percentage question and on the censuses to be established as a basis would not object to a vote first being taken on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, which proposes total exclusion. It seems to me that logically the Senator from Georgia should have his amendment voted on before we go into the question of percentages and censuses, and I should expect to second his request that his amendment be considered.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not think there is any objection at all to the request of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARRIS. With that understanding, then, of course, it is agreeable to me.

Mr. WILLIS. If the Senator will yield to me for a moment, I am very greatly interested in obtaining a vote on the committee amendment in line 10 on page 12, but I am quite agreeable to the suggestion now made by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Mississippi that before that is done, the Senator from Georgia may have a vote on his amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not think there will be any objection to that.

Mr. WILLIS. Not at all.

Mr. HARRIS. Then, we will get a vote on the amendment to provide total exclusion for five years; we will get a vote on the racial-group proposition; we will get a vote on a 1 per cent quota based on the census of 1910, and we will get a vote on the 2 per cent quota based on the census of 1890.

Mr. WILLIS. Precisely.

Mr. HARRISON. So that the Senate will have an opportunity to express itself by record vote as to which one of the methods they like the best.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That is exactly the situation.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. FLETCHER. As I understand, a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and now pending,

even if the amendment should be adopted, will not interfere with the motion the Senator from Mississippi proposes to make?

Mr. HARRISON. Did the Senator from Pennsylvania intend to have a vote to-night? I have not said anything with respect to my amendment. I have been awaiting an opportunity when it might be discussed.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I do not expect to ask for a vote on the Senator's amendment to-night, but I think we might as well vote on the pending amendment. I do not understand that there is any opposition to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Now, Mr. President, I ask that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], which proposes total exclusion for a period of five years, be now laid before the Senate and be considered next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to that order? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will state the proposed amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The READING CLERK. On page 12, it is proposed to strike out lines 9 to 22, both inclusive, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That for the period of five years, beginning 60 days after the passage of this act, the immigration of aliens into the United States is prohibited.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I do not mean to discuss this amendment at length, but I will ask the Senate to bear in mind in voting on it just what the effect of total exclusion will be.

I agree with the Senators who think that the United States can get along very well on its present population. This country is no longer underpopulated; but the amount of immigration which is provided in any of the schemes now proposed for adoption by the Senate is so much smaller than we have ever had before that I feel sure that the United States will not suffer from the amount of immigration provided under any of them, and when we consider the cruelty and the suffering that necessarily will result from the separation of families it seems to me—

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make a statement like that, because it is misleading. I should like to have the Clerk read my amendment. I have exactly the same exception in my amendment, in the very same words, that the Senator has.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have misunderstood the Senator's amendment if it does take care of such cases. I ask that the Secretary state the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will again state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. The amendment proposes to strike out lines 9 to 22, both inclusive—

Mr. HARRIS. That is not the amendment. I send the amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 12, it is proposed to strike out lines 9 to 22, both inclusive, and to insert the following:

That for the period of five years, beginning 60 days after the passage of this act, the immigration of aliens into the United States is prohibited.

#### DEFINITION OF "IMMIGRANT"

SEC. 3. When used in this act the term "immigrant" means any alien departing from any place outside the United States destined for the United States, except (1) a government official, his family, attendants, servants, and employees; (2) an alien visiting the United States temporarily as a tourist or temporarily for business, study, or pleasure; (3) an alien in continuous transit through the United States; (4) an alien lawfully admitted to the United States who later goes in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory; (5) a bona fide alien seaman serving as such on a vessel arriving at a port of the United States and seeking to enter temporarily the United States solely in the pursuit of his calling as a seaman; (6) an alien previously lawfully admitted to the United States who is returning from a temporary visit abroad; (7) the unmarried child under 18 years of age, father or mother over 55 years of age, the husband, or the wife of a citizen of the United States; and (8) an alien entitled to enter the United States solely to carry on trade under and in pursuance of the provisions of a present existing treaty of commerce and navigation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In order that the Record may be entirely clear, the Chair desires to state that the

amendment just read from the desk is the amendment to which the unanimous-consent agreement applies.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. And not the amendment first read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. And not the amendment first read. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask a question? The amendment that was just adopted, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, was to part of section 8. This amendment applies to it in its original form. Does this supersede the amendment that was offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and which was just adopted?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. As I understand, the amendment now pending would supersede subsection (a) of section 8, but would not affect the amendment just adopted as to national origin.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from Georgia whether he intends to nullify what the Senate did with respect to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania a few minutes ago?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, there is so much confusion that I could not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. HARRISON. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, that was adopted a while ago, as modified, provides that beginning on July 1, 1927, the number of immigrants shall not exceed 150,000 annually, based on racial groups in this country. The amendment of the Senator from Georgia provides for total exclusion for five years, as I understand.

Mr. HARRIS. That is it, with such exceptions as are stated. Mr. HARRISON. Consequently, it would nullify the amendment just adopted by the Senate; and the Senator intends to apply his amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, the same as to the rest of section 8?

Mr. HARRIS. That is my intention.

Mr. HARRISON. We had better know what we are voting on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS]. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes seem to have it.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROUSSARD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. If that Senator were present, however, he would vote as I propose to vote, and I therefore feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. Understanding from his speech that he would vote as I have voted, I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. FERNALD. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WILLIS. My colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], is unavoidably absent. I am advised that if he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. ERNST. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. COLT (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. FLETCHER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL], who is unavoidably absent. I am informed that he would vote as I have voted, and I will therefore allow my vote to stand.

Mr. McNARY. My colleague [Mr. STANFIELD] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] on account of serious illness in his family.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent.

I also desire to announce that the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is absent on account of serious illness in his family, and that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is absent on account of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—16			
Adams	Harris	Mayfield	Sheppard
Caraway	Harrison	Neely	Shields
Dial	Heflin	Overman	Smith
George	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Stephens
NAYS—46			
Brandegge	Fernald	McLean	Simmons
Broussard	Fletcher	McNary	Smoot
Bursum	Gerry	Norbeck	Spencer
Cameron	Glass	Norris	Sterling
Capper	Hale	Oddie	Swanson
Colt	Harrell	Pepper	Wadsworth
Copeland	Johnson, Minn.	Phillips	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Kendrick	Ralston	Warren
Dale	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	Weller
Edge	King	Reed, Pa.	Willis
Edwards	Lodge	Robinson	
Ernst	McKellar	Shipstead	
NOT VOTING—34			
Ashurst	Elkins	Ladd	Stanfield
Ball	Ferris	La Follette	Stanley
Bayard	Fess	Lenroot	Trammell
Borah	Frazier	McCormick	Underwood
Brookhart	Gooding	McKinley	Walsh, Mont.
Bruce	Greene	Moses	Watson
Couzens	Howell	Owen	Weller
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Ransdell	
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Shortridge	

So Mr. HARRIS's amendment was rejected.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment intended to be proposed to the bill to-morrow, but I am going to ask the privilege of having the amendment read, for the reason that it may come on for discussion early in the morning. I ask that it may be read, and then be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the proposed amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 12, at the end of line 22, the Senator from South Dakota proposes to insert:

*Provided, however,* That it shall be the duty of the Commissioner General of Immigration to ascertain the different racial groups constituting the people of any nation entitled to its quota of immigrants under this act, and the approximate number of people in each of said groups, and when it shall appear that the people of any nation are composed of commonly recognized and well-defined distinct racial groups such quota shall then be apportioned to the several racial groups in the ratio that the number in each such group bears to the entire population of such nation. That immigrants belonging to any racial group shall not be admitted in excess of the number so apportioned, nor shall the number of immigrants from any such nation or country exceed the aggregate of those apportioned to the several racial groups. The Commissioner General shall, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, prescribe all necessary rules and regulations for carrying these provisions into effect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. WILLIS. I ask that the committee amendment on page 12, line 10, be now reported. It was the understanding reached, that that is to be the next amendment taken up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the pending amendment. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 12, line 10, the committee proposes to strike out "200 and in addition thereto 1," and to insert the word "two," so as to read:

SEC. 8. The annual "quota" of any nationality shall be 2 per cent of the number of foreign-born individuals of such nationality resident in continental United States as determined by the United States census of 1910.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, just a brief statement concerning the parliamentary situation. I had printed an amendment intended to be offered reducing the percentage from 2 to 1. It will not be necessary to call up that amendment, because the same thing can be accomplished by voting down the committee amendment. Those who desire to reduce the percentage from 2 to 1 should therefore vote against the pending amendment.

It will be noted that the secretary properly read some other language; namely, "200 and in addition thereto"; that is to say, the bill provided originally for a minimum quota of 200, but at the bottom, in lines 21 and 22, that is changed by the committee to 100. So the question now involved is simply whether the percentage shall be 2 per cent or 1 per cent, based on the census returns of 1910.

There are two points to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate in that behalf. The argument urged against 2 per cent based on the census returns of 1890 is the fact that it is to some extent discriminatory against peoples coming from certain countries. For example, under the present law there can be an immigration from Austria in the year of 7,300. That would be cut down under the 2 per cent provision based on the census returns of 1890 to 1,100. Under the proposed amendment—that is to say, if the Senate votes against this amendment and makes it 1 per cent—the number would be 2,400.

Take another example. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] some time ago referred to the people of Czechoslovakia. Under the present law 14,000 can come in from that country every year. Under the 2 per cent proposition based on the census returns of 1890 the number would be cut down to 2,000, but under the proposition I am suggesting 4,200 would be admissible.

Take the case of Denmark. Under the present law 5,600 can come in from that country. Under the 2 per cent proposition based on the census of 1890 the number would be cut to 2,900. Under this proposal it would be 1,800.

In other words, the people of no nation can complain, because we are using the basis of the present law, and we propose to apply it to all nations the same. It is a fact that the argument can justly be made against 2 per cent based on the returns of 1890 that it does discriminate in favor of some nations and against others. Indeed, frankly, that is the purpose of that amendment.

I am calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that this proposition, which can be attained by simply voting down the committee amendment, is fair and equitable to all nations.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, as I understand the Senator, his proposition is to strike out 3 per cent and insert 1 per cent.

Mr. WILLIS. My proposition, and what I hope the Senate will do, is to vote down the committee amendment proposed to be inserted on line 10, which is to insert the word "two." If the Senate will vote that down, then the language of the original bill will stand, making it 1 per cent, if we leave it on the basis of the census of 1910. Of course, there may be other amendments, to change the census; but we are now talking about the percentage.

Mr. KING. The effect of the Senator's amendment would be to restrict immigration to approximately one hundred and fifteen to one hundred and twenty thousand?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes; approximately one hundred and fifteen or one hundred and twenty thousand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to make a statement at this point. When this committee amendment was reached in the regular course of procedure, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] offered the following amendment to it: On page 12, line 10, strike out "two" and insert "one," and in that situation the entire subject was passed over. The Chair is bound to recognize the pendency of the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to strike out "two" and insert "one."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I thought that had been covered in the agreement that was reached. Of course, I do not care whose amendment is voted on. I introduced an amendment at the same time, but I may suggest to the Senator from Georgia we will get at the specific thing in which he is interested, and in which a number of us are interested, simply by voting against the committee amendment. I hope the Senator from Georgia will consent to withdraw his amendment, as I have done mine, so as to come at the matter directly.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I offered an amendment to shut out immigration for five years. That having been voted down, I would now like to have the percentage reduced to 1 per cent, that being the next best thing. I am perfectly willing to have the Senator from Ohio offer his amendment in whatever form he desires to present it.

Mr. WILLIS. If the Senator will note, what he has in view by the introduction of his amendment and what I have sought to accomplish will be brought about directly by voting against the committee amendment.

There is only one other word I want to say, and that is to answer a question as to the effect 1 per cent will have on the number coming in. To those who are interested in restriction I want to say that this proposition to make it 1 per cent, based on the census of 1910, will make the number admissible practically 120,000 per year, but if it is made 2 per cent, based on the census of 1890, it will be more than that; that is to say, 169,000. The basis proposed in the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania would make it approximately 150,000. To those who actually want to restrict immigration I will say that this proposition will reduce it to

a smaller number than will any amendment now presented. I hope the Senate will vote against the pending committee amendment, and thus fix the basis at 1 per cent based on the census of 1910.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, on the table there is an amendment which I offered on the 3d of April proposing to change the word "two" to the word "three." Is it proper to present that amendment at this time as a substitute for the amendment suggested by the Senator from Ohio?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has not offered any amendment.

Mr. COPELAND. Is it proper for this amendment to be offered as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question, as the Chair understands it, is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator from Georgia announced his willingness and desire to withdraw his amendment, as I understood him, so the question would be on the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not understand the Senator from Georgia as withdrawing his amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, what I want is to get a vote on the proposition to reduce the percentage from two to one. If the Senator's amendment reaches that result without any complications, I am willing that it should be offered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands, then, that the Senator from Georgia withdraws his amendment, and the question is upon agreeing or disagreeing to the committee amendment. The Senator from New York asks if a further amendment to that amendment is in order. A further amendment is in order.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It seems to me that under our unanimous-consent agreement the next business before the Senate is the adoption or rejection of the committee amendment, which is to strike out the words read by the Secretary and to insert the word "two." Under our unanimous-consent agreement no other amendment can be considered until the committee amendments are first disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment suggested by the Senator from New York is an amendment to the committee amendment, and is therefore in order.

Mr. COPELAND. I offer, then, as an amendment on page 12, line 10, that the word "two" be stricken out before "per centum" and the word "three" inserted. I want to speak on that in due time, but perhaps the Senate would like to recess now.

Mr. REED of Missouri. If the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I think we might as well recess now, because I know the Senator is very much in earnest about his amendment and I know that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] will oppose anything that has 3 per cent in it. [Laughter.] We will therefore have a long controversy and we might as well recess now.

Mr. LODGE. I understand an agreement has already been made to take a recess at the conclusion of to-day's business.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. An agreement has already been made to take a recess, and if the Senator from New York will yield to me to make the motion—

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I move that the unanimous-consent agreement be carried out and that the Senate take a recess until noon to-morrow.

Mr. COPELAND. I understand that I will have the floor to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to take a recess is not in order as long as the Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. LODGE. I understand it has been agreed that we shall take a recess when the Senate concludes its business to-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has not concluded its business.

Mr. COPELAND. I think it hardly fair for me to detain the Senate to-night.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas will state the point of order.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think the Chair does not understand the situation. The point of order is that the Senator from New

York [Mr. COPELAND] yielded to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] to make a motion that the Senate carry out its unanimous-consent agreement and take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. LODGE. That motion is in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not understand the Senator from New York to yield for that purpose.

Mr. LODGE. He yielded for that precise purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON. If he did not do so then, I know he will do so now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York a moment ago, as the Chair understood him, stated that he had not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. COPELAND. I beg the Chair's pardon; I stated I would yield that a recess might be taken.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from New York yield to me now?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate execute its unanimous-consent agreement heretofore made and take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, April 17, 1924, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, April 16, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Loving heavenly, heavenly Father—in whose mighty world we are grateful to be awake again—we thank Thee for the morning hour with its new revelation of Thy power and glory. Renew our strength with the birth of each new day. Reveal to us the beauties and the opportunities of life, and may our daily labor become to us a sacrament. Always keep our ambitions and purposes set on worthy objects. O give us the wisdom and the grace to receive Thee to our hearts. This day—so beautiful—may the glory of nature above and the promise of the earth below inspire us to see Thy face and to magnify Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Welch, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2797. An act to authorize the payment of claims under the provisions of the so-called war minerals relief act.

### SENATE BILL REFERRED

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 2797. An act to authorize the payments of claims under the provisions of the so-called war minerals relief act; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLUM from the Committee on Enrolled Bills reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 655. An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

### AN EXPLANATION

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when the immigration bill was up for consideration my colleagues, Messrs. CLARK and DRANE of Florida, were unavoidably absent. I understand they were both paired, but there is some misunderstanding,

and the report has gotten out that they were opposed to the immigration bill. If my colleagues had been present I have been assured, and I can assure the House, I believe, that both of them would have voted for the immigration bill as it passed the House, and therefore I desire to make this statement and have it go in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE TYSON OF ALABAMA

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last, the House made an order setting aside Sunday, May 18, 1924, for memorial services on the life, character, and public services of Hon. JOHN R. TYSON, late a Representative from the State of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent that that order be set aside and vacated and that an order be entered setting aside Sunday, May 25, 1924, for memorial services on the life, character, and public services of Hon. JOHN R. TYSON, late a Representative from the State of Alabama.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that Sunday, May 25, be substituted for May 18, for memorial services on the life, character, and public services of Hon. JOHN R. TYSON, late a Representative from the State of Alabama. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. It is so ordered.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the attention of our administration friends on my right to the fact that we have enough Members on this side to transact business this morning. We understand that the public business has been much delayed, and we are ready to help, but they do not seem to come to our aid. I am just suggesting to the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle that here we are ready to transact the business of the country, and we plead with them that they keep enough Members here to help keep business going.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman believe that 30 Members are enough to transact business?

Mr. BLANTON. That is twice 15.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I not only believe but know that all the time we have been keeping enough over here to help you folks do business, but often you do not have even a handful. It is not tight.

### HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW—11 O'CLOCK A. M.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Thanking the gentleman for his assurance that the Members on his side are ready to help transact business, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourns to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourns to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker; will that be Friday?

The SPEAKER. No; Thursday.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I would object if it were Friday, but as it is I do not.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Thursday always follows Wednesday. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House meets to-morrow, after the disposal of matters on the Speaker's desk, I be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to address the House for 40 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Reserving the right to object, on what subject?

Mr. DAVEY. The occasion for this address is the fact that the President of the United States has proclaimed next week as forest-protection week, and I desire to address the House on the subject of trees and their advantage to human life.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. If we are going to continue work on the legislation that is now before us, all right; but the making of addresses of the kind the gentleman wants to make

may interfere with public business. However, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

## IMMIGRATION

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in extending remarks on the immigration bill, I would like to have permission to include a letter which I received from Secretary Davis, of the Department of Labor, on Mexican and Canadian immigration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. The immigration bill, H. R. 7995, which we have passed in this House does not apply the quotas to contiguous or other American territory. I believe this is its weak point, one that ought to be remedied by immediate supplemental legislation. What shall it avail us to close the ways of the Atlantic and the Pacific, if we leave open the thousands of miles along our southern and northern boundaries?

If across these boundaries we received only Mexicans and Canadians, the matter might not be so serious, but we find many Europeans entering America by these back doors which we have left open. We let in not only Mexicans who can pass the literacy and health tests, but Europeans who have lived five years in those countries, and the forging and falsifying of certificates of residence are easily accomplished.

The extent of this immigration is almost inconceivable. During the first six months of the present fiscal year we have admitted 41,769 from Mexico and 103,616 from British North America, as set forth in Mr. Davis's letter. These numbers were admitted legally. How many more came illegally because we have not men enough in the service to patrol these borders? The extent of this illegal immigration is also set forth in the letter of the Secretary of Labor.

It has been said in the course of the debates on the bill which we have passed that if the existing laws were enforced not a thousand could come in from Mexico, for it was estimated that from 75 to 90 per cent of such applicants are illiterate. This is not borne out by the facts. The Mexicans who are admitted can pass and have passed such literacy tests. I believe the requirement is the ability to read 41 words, and the Mexicans seem to have proceeded that far in their education. We can not protect ourselves by merely enforcing existing laws.

Smugglers in immigration operate on our land borders as successfully, or more so, as smugglers in alcoholic liquors. To the south there is what the Secretary of Labor calls "an imaginary line through a 1,000-mile desert." Smugglers charge immigrants \$4 a head, which is half of the legal price per head. It constitutes a profitable business. The immigration officials are constantly on the alert with what men they have at command, and they are constantly deporting immigrants who have entered illegally. We ought to give to the Department of Labor more men and means to do this work if we want it done at all. And if we do not do it, of what avail are the restrictions in the bill which we have just passed and which we hope to see enacted into final law?

APRIL 15, 1924.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,

Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the course of a debate on the floor of the House on the immigration bill, it was asserted by Representative RAKER, of California, that while the number of Mexican laborers and Canadians entering the country was large and to that extent serious, the situation did not call for new legislation, for the reason that these admissions were due to nonenforcement of existing laws and not due to lack of laws. This, and other statements of like nature, leads me to submit to you the following questions:

1. Are these statements correct?
2. What number of Mexicans and Canadians have entered the country in recent years?
3. Are the literacy, physical, and mental tests being enforced against aliens applying for admission from contiguous territory?
4. What changes in the immigration law enforcement personnel have been made since the beginning of the present administration?
5. What active steps does the Immigration Service take against aliens smuggled in across land borders?
6. Would larger appropriations for the enforcement of the immigration laws reduce immigration from Canada and Mexico?
7. Would the registration of aliens help to stop the illegal entry of aliens into this country?

I would be pleased if you could furnish me with answers to these questions, for I believe that they would help to solve a problem that was left unsolved by the bill which was passed in the House last week.

Sincerely,

CYRENUS COLE.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, April 15, 1924.

Hon. CYRENUS COLE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In answer to your letter of April 14, I will answer, so far as possible, seriatim, the questions you raise.

1. That statement that more rigorous enforcement of the general immigration laws would reduce materially the number of admissions of aliens from Canada and Mexico is not substantially correct. While it is true that a larger patrol force would reduce the number of surreptitious entries, all the forces in the world could not keep out any alien able to read the required language cards, pass the mental and physical tests, and pay the small head tax of \$8 so long as the law places no other restriction or limitation against him. Millions could qualify for admission to-day if they but presented themselves at a regular inspection point. The illiterate Mexicans who are here have come in surreptitiously.

2. Following is a table showing number of aliens admitted from Mexico and Canada during the past five years:

<i>Mexico</i>	
1919	29,818
1920	52,361
1921	30,758
1922	19,551
1923	63,768
<i>First six months, 1924</i>	
1924	41,769
<i>British North America</i>	
1919	57,782
1920	90,025
1921	72,317
1922	46,810
1923	117,011
<i>First six months, 1924</i>	
1924	103,616

The fluctuations shown above represent many factors other than economic conditions. They reflect to a great extent the vacillating policy with reference to law enforcement on the Mexican border prior to the coming in of the present administration, to some extent they reflect war conditions, and to a large extent the present policy of limiting immigration from Europe. The greater the restriction against Europe the greater will be the number of Mexican and Canadian admissions, unless the same restriction is made to apply to the countries of this hemisphere. If a demand exists for common labor and that labor is not permitted to come in from Europe, the employers of labor are going to look toward Mexico and Canada as a source of supply. An "open-door" policy toward the Americas also leads to greater activity for smugglers of aliens and an increasingly difficult enforcement of all the provisions of the immigration law.

You will note the fluctuation in these recorded admissions. One cause for this was an order made on May 22, 1917, by the then Secretary of Labor, instructing immigration officials on the Mexican border to disregard the literacy test, the contract-labor section, and the head-tax provision of the immigration law with reference to the coming of Mexican people who were to engage as workmen in agricultural pursuits. This order remained in force until March 2, 1921, or until within two days of the passing out of the Wilson administration. I have never been able to learn how many people came under that provision. I find one statement in the files to the effect that during the fiscal year 1919 there were imported under this rule a total of 9,998. It is my understanding that none of those coming under this arrangement were counted as immigrants, because they were admitted on the theory of coming temporarily and with the condition that they must be returned to the place from which they came. I have been unable to know how many of them returned. Substantially, the report was made to me that most of them had violated the conditions of their admission and had left the particular employers to whom they had come.

It appears that about January 1, 1920, a suggestion was made for legislative action authorizing the practice of permitting Mexican laborers to come for agricultural purposes regardless of the contract-labor, literacy, and head-tax provisions of the law, and that pending such action instructions went out that the original order remain in force.

Under date of March 19, 1920, the assistant chief of staff for military intelligence made a report to the director of military intelligence upon this subject. He reports, among other things, that since the suspension of the provisions of the immigration law relating to Mexican laborers it was estimated from facts furnished by Mexican and American border officers that in excess of 100,000 Mexicans entered the United States between February 1, 1920, and the date of his report; that these laborers entered the United States ostensibly for the purpose of seeking employment; that but a small part of this number had passed through immigration stations, and that by far the greater part of them had entered the country surreptitiously; that for many weeks prior to his report every road leading from the

south into San Antonio, Tex., had on it a stream of these immigrants, many of them in rags; that many of these Mexicans declared they were leaving Mexico to escape abuse and mistreatment by armed factions in that country; that not in a single case investigated did it appear that these people came to the United States because of offers of employment or inducements of that kind.

I find many reports in the files covering this transaction, and in other files that these Mexicans were crowding American workmen out of their jobs because they were willing to take employment at wages which would not permit the worker to live on the basis of American standards of living. One report, in March, 1920, indicates that there were at that time about 100 Mexicans in the city of Pocatello, Idaho, and that two-thirds of them were working on municipal improvement work and on buildings in open competition with American workers.

3. All of the literacy, physical, and mental laws prescribed by the act of 1917 are being enforced against aliens applying for admission from contiguous territory. As I have previously indicated, the laws were very much relaxed under the former administration and were not all again officially put into force until March 2, 1921. You realize, however, that the Department of Labor is not responsible for the adequacy or efficiency of the physical and mental tests. They are imposed by the Public Health Service. After I took office I insisted that the slack which was given out during the previous years be taken up so that the borders should be as tightly closed as possible against surreptitious entries and especially in the enforcement of all the provisions of the law applicable to those applying regularly at immigrant stations. This has been done, and the Commissioner General, with whom I have again just conferred, states that he has received reports from every inspector in charge that my instructions have been carried out and that the tests are all in full force and effect. The literacy test cards have been changed from time to time to make them more effective.

While endeavoring to assume undue credit for extensive and persistent enforcement of the immigration laws on the Mexican border, it is my firm belief that the law has never been more rigidly adhered to. It is also my belief that the fact that the official reports for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1923, indicate a very large increase of immigration from Mexico to the United States, is explained by the gradual success of efforts to prevent surreptitious entry from that country by compelling those who wish to come to pass through the official stations in the regular way and meet the requirement of the law. I am not vain enough to believe that our efforts have been wholly successful, and I admit with considerable humiliation that I believe that at least as many more entered from Mexico during the past fiscal year through irregular channels as were recorded by the offices of the Government at our immigration stations. Assistant Secretary Henning has just returned from an inspection of conditions on the southern border. He reports that it is generally estimated that there is not less than twice as many surreptitious entries as legal ones and our inspector in charge at Laredo places the number at five times the legal admissions. The Rio Grande River has practically a dry bed during eight months of the year and forms a thousand miles of boundary between Mexico and the United States. Even when it is at its maximum flood, it is not too much of a barrier. Our files indicate that smugglers agree to carry aliens across and endeavor to land them safely at \$4 per head, which is only half the amount of the head tax. From El Paso west there is only an imaginary line through a thousand miles of desert, and many people find it convenient to cross to the States from Mexico at points where there is no human habitation for a hundred miles.

4. There have been no extensive changes in the personnel of the Immigration Field Service. You are fully aware, Congressman, that the personnel of the Immigration Service is almost wholly made up of civil-service employees, and for the most part, changes which have occurred during the present administration are the natural result of resignations and replacements controlled by the Civil Service Commission. The service has, however, been reorganized so that we are getting more out of the men employed, and given them to understand that the job of immigrant inspection is not one to be played with.

We have, in addition to the regular force, organized a patrol under the leadership of a man well known for his ability in handling smugglers and detecting the presence of Mexican violators of the law. He has pursued his activities so religiously that a price has been laid on his head by Mexican bandits, making his activities exceedingly dangerous to him. I merely mention this fact to show you the activity of our immigration patrol. For the most part, however, I am not responsible for the personnel of the service. It was here when I came.

5. I have just referred to the activity of our border patrol on the Mexican frontier. A similar force is organized on the Canadian front, though its duties are not attended by such great personal risk as on the southern border. We are constantly on the watch for smuggled aliens and follow every lead given to us in running them down. When caught they are immediately shipped out. Aliens who have come from other countries and merely used the adjacent territory as a means of

evading the laws relating to admission by the "front door" are returned to the countries from which they originally came. If the alien be a Mexican, ineligible for admission because of inability to pass the required tests and furnish the \$8 head tax, he is escorted across the border. There is nothing, of course, to prevent that alien from doing the same trick over again and perhaps the second, third, or some later time succeed in making his way into one of the Northern States. This is a very active process.

6. As to your query, would larger appropriations for enforcement of the immigration laws reduce immigration from Canada and Mexico, the Commissioner General of Immigration recently testified before the Immigration Committee of the House of Representatives that with 250 additional men on patrol on each border the number of surreptitious entries could be decreased to the minimum, and that to provide this force, together with necessary equipment, would require about \$1,000,000. This, however, would not in any manner affect the number of Mexicans and Canadians who would or could enter through regular channels. To the very limit of its ability the Immigration Service has sought out and deported those unlawfully here, and prosecutions have been instituted, and in a great many cases convictions have been obtained against those responsible for and participating in the illegal entry of aliens, but such activity can never take the place of a law restricting the number which may be admitted by inspectors. That number will increase rather than decrease with the tightening of the border and the increasing demand for common labor which can not be supplied from Europe.

I have been given to understand that the Mexican Government is opposed to the immigration of Mexican workmen to the United States. I find in my files, for example, a letter of the Secretary of State of the United States, dated March 29, 1920 (Me 81111.504/203), in which he transmits a copy of a despatch dated March 11, 1920, from the American consul at Mexico City, "in further relation to the steps the Mexican Government is reported to be taking to prevent Mexican laborers from emigrating to the United States for the purpose of accepting employment in this country." In his communication the American consul calls to the attention of the Secretary of State of the United States the salient points in a bulletin issued by the Mexican Ministry of the Interior and published in the Official Gazette March 10, 1920, and states, "This bulletin is in line with the policy of the Mexican Government to discourage such emigration."

I have learned through personal contacts with prominent men in Canada that the Canadian people would gladly submit to a uniform rule with reference to the movement of aliens from all the world into the United States if that rule would result in keeping the United States free from the presence therein of large numbers of people of low standards of living, who are not assimilable with the Caucasian race. They believe over there that the presence in the United States of great numbers of these people will ultimately mean their entry into Canada. You, of course, know that under existing law Canadian authorities reject many Americans who desire to enter Canada, and in many ways the restrictions in Canadian law are more potent and extensive than the proposed quota limitations for the coming of Canadians to the United States under pending American legislation.

7. Now, your question about the registration—of course that would, in my mind, settle the whole problem. There is some opposition on the part of some of the representatives of labor to this plan on the theory that it savors of espionage. I want you to understand, Congressman, that I will not sponsor a bill which would permit of Government officers spying on the alien or work a hardship upon him in any way as long as he is legally within the country and conducting himself as a peaceful and law-abiding resident. What I am trying to do is to work out a plan in the form of a bill which might be called "Uncle Sam's fraternity"—an organized movement to be helpful to the alien. Personally I would not want to call aliens those who come here to join with us in building up this country. I would call them "friends." We should provide some means of helping the worthy alien and weeding out at the same time the undesirable ones. That is the purpose and essence of my enrollment plan. As soon as I have completed the draft of the bill which I shall recommend I will be glad to send you a copy.

In closing, Mr. Congressman, let me call your attention to Senate bill S. 2365, introduced by Senator WARSON, of Indiana, the provisions of which extend the principle of limitation of immigration to the countries of the Western Hemisphere. It also provides a method for taking care of seasonal and special labor needs through the use of special immigration certificates. I am inclosing a copy of this bill, and I know you will agree with me that we should not lock the front door without supplying some means of closing the back gate.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. DAVIS.

What is the remedy for the evils set forth in this letter from the Secretary of Labor? There must be a remedy found, or all we have done so far will have been in vain.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box], a member of the committee, "greatly regretted" that the provisions of the bill could not be applied to Mexico, and, by inference, to Canada.

The same gentleman confessed, or admitted, that the committee found the task so great that they did not dare to extend the restrictions to Canada and to Mexico, in fear of losing support for the bill.

Was that fear reasonable? I think not. The bill would have passed with as large and, perhaps, larger majority had its provisions been extended to the two contiguous territories. Many professed their opposition to the bill was based on the fact that it did not include Mexico. The chairman of the committee [Mr. JOHNSON] has promised that some supplemental legislation will be introduced. I hope that will be done.

I am sorry it was not included in the bill that we have passed. We could have cleaned up this whole matter in one piece of legislation, had the committee so willed it.

I believe that the least we can do now is to place both Canada and Mexico under the same quotas, with, perhaps, regulated admissions from Mexico, in conformity with reasonable employments, the same to be under the control of the Department of Labor. The 2 per cent quota, if applied to Mexico, would admit only 1,500 a year from that country—and if we want to keep America and American labor especially, truly American, that number may be ample.

The bill which has been passed is in need of immediate revision.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. To-day is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

The Committee on Agriculture was called.

#### SALE OF FARM PRODUCTS ABROAD

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Agriculture, I call up the bill H. R. 7111.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up the bill H. R. 7111, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7111) to promote American agriculture by making more extensively available by expanding the service now rendered by the Department of Agriculture in gathering and disseminating information regarding agricultural production, competition, and demand in foreign countries in promoting the sale of farm products abroad, and in other ways.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar and the House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, just a moment. Before we go into the committee, I think we ought to have some understanding about time.

The SPEAKER. The rule provides the time. That is a matter for the committee to determine and not for the House.

Mr. BLANTON. I thought it might be determined here. I just want a few minutes. I do not ask to control any time, but I want just a few minutes on this bill.

The SPEAKER. That can be determined in the committee. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7111) to promote American agriculture by making more extensively available by expanding the service now rendered by the Department of Agriculture in gathering and disseminating information regarding agricultural production, competition, and demand in foreign countries in promoting the sale of farm products abroad, and in other ways, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 7111, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7111) to promote American agriculture by making more extensively available by expanding the service now rendered by the Department of Agriculture in gathering and disseminating information regarding agricultural production, competition, and demand in foreign countries in promoting the sale of farm products abroad, and in other ways.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM].

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I understand that under the rules of the House on Calendar Wednesday there is an hour on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the rule, as the Chair understands it. Any Member, within the ordinary practice as to recognition, who is opposed to the legislation before the committee will be entitled to recognition after the gentleman in charge of the bill has either exhausted his time or reserved the balance of his time.

Mr. KINCHELOE. My purpose in asking that was that I did not know whether there would be anybody having control of the time or not.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman proposing the bill is entitled to an hour, which he can use as he desires, and then any gentleman opposed to the bill is entitled to an hour.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The point I had in mind was whether the time would be under the control of two gentlemen and they would dispose of that time for and against the bill.

Mr. TILSON. I believe that it has so long been the custom that it might be considered as the established practice in this House that on Calendar Wednesday the one in charge of the bill has an hour, and then if anyone of the committee is opposed to the bill he is recognized first. After that, if no member of the committee is opposed to the bill, some other Member of the House should be recognized if opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands the rule and practice and will govern himself accordingly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the Chair will pardon me, I believe it to be the best practice that when there is no opposition that only an hour is taken in debate; that is to say, that anybody who is not in opposition is not entitled to an additional hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands the rule and the procedure. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the purpose of this bill, H. R. 7111, is well indicated in the title, and if I may have the attention of the committee I think a careful reading of it will clearly convey to all who are interested what is intended to be accomplished by the bill.

The title reads as follows:

A bill to promote American agriculture by making more extensively available by expanding the service now rendered by the Department of Agriculture in gathering and disseminating information regarding agricultural production, competition, and demand in foreign countries in promoting the sale of farm products abroad, and in other ways.

The bill contains four brief paragraphs intended to give legislative form to the suggestions incorporated in the title.

I think all of us who are at all familiar with the agricultural situation recognize the great difficulties which it confronts, and I am sure that the temper of this body is to do everything that can be done in the way of legislation to give relief.

It has seemed to some of us—and I believe that much of the legislation before the House of Representatives points in that direction—that a careful consideration of the development of foreign markets is one of the things that will afford a very considerable measure of relief to agriculture, and it is with that purpose that the bill has been introduced, giving to the Department of Agriculture a bit more leeway with reference to the conduct of its work in the development of foreign markets.

I may say for the information of the committee that for many years—going back as far as 1883 and coming on down through the years from that time—there have been appearing in our appropriation bills for the Department of Agriculture sections that gave that department the right to go into the foreign fields and gather and to disseminate information that would be valuable to our American farmers, looking particularly toward the sale of their products in foreign fields.

All of you who have followed the development of agriculture in recent years know that with the intensification of that work many new ideas have been developed, not only in our own agriculture but especially in fields abroad, and I think we may fairly say that many of the farmers of Europe have developed various plans that would be of great value to us, and so studies have been made in many of these foreign countries where their practices have in them something of suggestion to our own farmers, and these studies have been brought back by the Department of Agriculture and made available for our own farmers.

It is the purpose of this bill to mark out clearly the fields in which our Department of Agriculture may work. They have been doing considerable work in this field in the days gone

by, but the department feels that possibly the lines have not been marked out with sufficient clearness, and it is the purpose of the various paragraphs of this bill to do just that thing.

Now, may I call attention, very briefly, to the four paragraphs of the bill. The first one simply gives form to the purpose expressed in the title and indicates the field into which the department may go in obtaining and disseminating this information, and the language of the bill, I think, would be enlightening at this point and I do not think any discussion beyond the mere reading will be necessary.

Paragraph 1 gives the Department of Agriculture the power to acquire and to disseminate useful information that will enable American farmers to adjust their operations and practices better to meet world conditions, especially information concerning agricultural economics, farm management, and agricultural marketing practices employed in foreign countries, and the past, present, and prospective production of and demand for agricultural products in foreign countries, including animals and animal products, dairy products, cereals, fibers, fruits, vegetables, nuts, and other farm and forest products.

Paragraph 2 simply gives the Department of Agriculture the authority to cooperate with American producers, farm organizations and associations of various kinds in extending and strengthening the demand for agricultural products abroad.

Paragraph 3 of the bill gives to these representatives of our Department of Agriculture abroad, the rank of agricultural attachés, and in order that the members of the committee may understand that this has the approval of the Department of State, I submitted paragraph 3, to the Department of State, together with a suggested substitute for it, in order to meet fully what was believed to be the wishes of the Department of State, and I submit a letter from the Secretary of State giving his approval of the substitute that will be offered, differing only in language from the section that appears in the bill:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, March 19, 1924.

Hon. JOHN C. KETCHAM,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of March 8, 1924, submitting a redraft of section 3 of your bill, H. R. 7111, relative to the manner of accrediting agricultural attachés. As observed by you the original language of this section is not altogether appropriate as it proposes that the Department of State shall accredit agricultural attachés in the same manner as a secretary in an embassy or legation, whereas in the strict sense only ambassadors and ministers are accredited to foreign governments. The language of the proposed substitute appears to meet all requirements and to provide in the correct way for establishing these officers with appropriate standing as a part of the diplomatic mission.

I have the honor to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

Paragraph 4 simply gives to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and also the right to cooperate with any department or agency of any government, any State, Territory, District, or possession in connection with this work.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. In just a moment. I have almost completed my statement, and at its conclusion I shall be very glad to yield to anyone to answer any questions I may be able to answer.

I may say that this bill has been given very careful study not only by the Department of Agriculture and all the departments that are interested particularly in it, specifically the Department of State, but has been submitted also to the various farm organizations of the country.

The approval of the Department of Agriculture is expressed in a letter from Secretary Wallace, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, February 23, 1924.

Hon. G. N. HAUGEN,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HAUGEN: I have your letter of February 16 requesting my opinion on a bill (H. R. 5568) introduced by Mr. KETCHAM, "To promote American agriculture by making more extensively available and by expanding the service now rendered by the Department of Agriculture in gathering and disseminating information regarding agricultural production, competition, and demand in foreign countries in promoting the sale of farm products abroad and in other ways."

This proposed legislation has been given very careful study by this department. We regard it as necessary to enable us to continue unhampered our service to American agricultural interests. It is not necessary for me to explain to you the need of this work and especially the necessity of leaving nothing undone that can be done to maintain and extend foreign markets for our surplus agricultural products. This bill defines the scope of the work of the department in the foreign field and puts it in the form of permanent legislation, so that there can not possibly be any misunderstanding as to the authority for work which the department has been carrying on for the past 40 years. I trust there will be no delay in enacting it into law.

Very truly,

HENRY C. WALLACE.

The following statement shows that the farmers' organizations indorse it:

H. R. 7111, introduced by Mr. KETCHAM, is a bill to promote American agriculture by making available and expanding the service now rendered by the Department of Agriculture in gathering and disseminating information regarding agricultural production, competition, and demand in foreign countries in promoting the sale of farm products abroad and in other ways. We strongly urge all Senators and Congressmen to facilitate the passage of this bill. There never was a time in the history of American agriculture when there was a greater need of the activities contemplated by this bill.

Respectfully submitted.

L. J. Taber, master National Grange; T. C. Atkeson, Washington representative of the Grange; C. S. Barrett, president Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America; F. J. Haganbarth, president National Wool Growers' Association, by S. W. McClure; A. M. Loomis, secretary American Dairy Federation and secretary National Dairy Union; Geo. C. Jewett, general manager American Wheat Growers' Association; Chas. V. Holman secretary National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation and secretary National Board of Farm Organizations; Chester Davis, commissioner of agriculture, State of Montana; Western Tariff Association, by S. W. McClure, manager; Pendleton Commercial Association, by S. R. Thompson, chairman agricultural committee, also president of Oregon Export League; Chas. E. Hearst, president Iowa State Farm Bureau, Des Moines; George E. Duis, North Dakota Wheat Growers' Association, Grand Forks, N. Dak.; W. L. Stockton, Clarkston, Mont., president Montana State Farm Bureau; Carl Gunderson, South Dakota Wheat Growers' Association, Mitchell, S. Dak.; G. P. Mix, Moscow, Idaho; T. C. Winn, Nephi, Utah; A. R. Shumway, Milton, Oreg., Oregon Wheat Growers' Association; Hubert Egbert, president Farmers' Union, The Dalles, Oreg.; S. Sykes, president Corn Belt Meat Producers' Association.

Mr. Chairman, summing up the argument in support of this legislation, the purpose of this bill is to put into permanent form legislative authority now carried in the annual appropriation bill; to clearly define the field of activities of the department relative to foreign markets for American agricultural products and relative to competition in agricultural production in foreign countries, in order to remove any uncertainty as to legal authority; and to broaden the language so as to include in the scope of the department's work a consideration of relative cost of production, cooperative marketing, standardization of farm products, and so forth, as applied to world agriculture.

It is now well recognized that, to be of most service to the farmer, information as to production and marketing agricultural products must embrace the whole field of agricultural production and cover the potential world demand for these products, as prices are fixed largely by world production and foreign demand. With respect to the United States, the annual appropriation acts provide for collection and dissemination of crop and market information, economic and cost studies of the production and distribution of farm products, standardization, methods of handling, shipping and marketing of farm products; in short, provides for a complete coordinated program covering all essential subjects on which information should be had regarding the marketing and production of farm products.

This bill proposes to give the authority to the Department of Agriculture to continue its activities which will enable the American farmer to have information with regard to supply of and demand for agricultural products throughout the world and a knowledge of probable future developments in the agricultural situation in foreign countries.

The need for a well-defined and consistent policy with regard to collecting and disseminating information with regard to world demand for and production of agricultural products is greater now than at any time in the history of the country. The American farmer is looking to the Department for intelligent guidance in planning his program of production, and this can be given only when the department is in an unhampered position to study conditions throughout the world.

I think sufficient has been said unless there are some questions. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. The speaker has very clearly elucidated all but one provision of the bill, and I am not quite clear about that. I would like to know whether or not it is the intention of the committee to have these appointments made from the civil-service list, or are they to be made at the will and the pleasure of the Secretary of Agriculture alone?

Mr. KETCHAM. If the gentleman will pardon me for the moment, I will get a draft of the substitute for paragraph 3, which has been approved by the Secretary of State, and read it. I think that will answer the question more clearly and more directly than anything I might say to the gentleman. The language of paragraph 3, as approved by the Secretary of State, reads as follows:

The agricultural commissioners at present representing the Department of Agriculture in foreign countries shall hereafter be known as agricultural attachés, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to appoint from time to time other agricultural attachés, after an examination to be held under his direction and in accordance with the regulations of the Civil Service Commission to determine their competency. Such officers when designated for assignment to foreign posts by the Secretary of Agriculture shall, through the Department of State, be regularly and officially attached to the diplomatic missions of the United States in the countries in which they are to be stationed, and when such officers are assigned to countries in which there is no diplomatic mission of the United States, appropriate recognition and standing with full facilities for discharging their official duties shall be arranged by the Department of State: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State may reject the name of any such officer whose assignment to the foreign post for which he has been designated would, in his judgment, be prejudicial to the public policy of the United States.

By this language the gentleman will clearly see that these attachés are to be appointed after an examination to be held under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture and in accordance with the regulations of the Civil Service Commission to determine the competency of the men to be appointed.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. That is very satisfactory, and will the gentleman permit just one more question? Does the gentleman not think that in our splendid American language there might be some word to take the place of that nasty foreign word you have in there—attaché?

Mr. KETCHAM. I am sure that the genius and the ability of the gentleman in such matters is very greatly appreciated, and I am enough of an American to share some of the spirit he has, but inasmuch as this is the language in which all the diplomatic business of the world is couched, I suppose probably we had better fall into the form and forego our patriotism in that particular.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. That genius and ability of which the gentleman speaks is laid at his feet, and if you want me to help rewrite the bill in the American language, I will do it.

Mr. KETCHAM. In turn, may I say I will submit that to those who have these matters in charge? They are matters beyond the purview and the power of the gentleman who is now occupying the floor.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. COLTON. Reverting to paragraph 3, will there be a duplication of work on the part of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce? Is it not a fact that the Department of Commerce now gathers much of this information?

Mr. KETCHAM. I may say to the gentleman that the purpose of this bill is to avoid any duplication with any other department or any conflict.

Mr. COLTON. Let me say to the gentleman that I am entirely in sympathy with the bill, and I had understood there would be no duplication.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan. Mr. MAPES. Other departments are sending men abroad to do work for other industries outside of agriculture similar to that it is proposed to have these agents do for agriculture, are they not?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes; it is contemplated that that will be done, and the purpose of this bill is not in any way to come in conflict but to supplement the work that is being done by other agencies of the Government.

Mr. MAPES. The Department of Commerce, through the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, sends men into the same countries that these men will go, doing work for industries outside of agriculture, does it not?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. And the State Department is doing some such work through the Consular Service?

Mr. KETCHAM. It has done some work of that sort.

Mr. COLTON. This requires a technical knowledge that men who have not the knowledge can not get.

Mr. KETCHAM. That is true. Agriculture has become so highly differentiated that there is much technical information that must be gathered and made available for our own people, and that requires people particularly skilled and trained in a line of work that can not be done by other men in other departments. It is not duplication of work or trespassing on work in other territory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KETCHAM. I will.

Mr. MAPES. My understanding was that the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture were attempting to get together and to reach an understanding so that it would prevent duplication of this work; has that been accomplished?

Mr. KETCHAM. I think the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture may submit a statement from the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that will be satisfactory.

Mr. MAPES. A few days ago I received information that this bill would not come up to-day or until after an understanding between the two departments had been worked out.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman will permit, I conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and he is perfectly willing that the bill should come up and the gentleman will be here on the floor.

Mr. HERSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I will.

Mr. HERSEY. I understand from the gentleman's bill that this is enlarging the work of the Agricultural Department along similar lines that they have worked in the past.

Mr. KETCHAM. Somewhat.

Mr. HERSEY. Now, will the gentleman give us some estimate of the probable additional cost, the annual cost, by the enlargement of the bureau along these lines.

Mr. KETCHAM. I can not answer that, but whatever small increase is required could be handled under the provisions now in the appropriation bill. If it is found that the work is so important as to require a special appropriation the department might come back and submit estimates in the regular way, but no increase in the appropriation is asked under the terms of this bill.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. KETCHAM. I will.

Mr. MAPES. Am I to understand that the committee has consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who has introduced a bill somewhat similar for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce, and that this bill is satisfactory to the Department of Commerce as it is now drawn?

Mr. KETCHAM. That is the word of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Certainly.

Mr. HASTINGS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the farm organizations throughout the country—the names of which he will place in the Record—have indorsed this bill?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Have any of them opposed it?

Mr. KETCHAM. None has opposed it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Has it been generally submitted and have they had an opportunity to study the provisions of the bill?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. There is no minority report?

Mr. KETCHAM. No.

Mr. HASTINGS. Was there any objection to the bill before the committee?

Mr. KETCHAM. No objections in the hearings before the committee. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. Is any member of the committee opposed to the bill? If not, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, had there been any member of the committee opposed to this bill, I would have preferred taking 10 or 15 minutes from him, and I hope to use only that length of time; but in discussing the question with some of my colleagues from time to time as to the manner by which we are increasing from year to year the number of bureaus, institutions, and expenses of the Government, I have found that many Members do not know how and where it creeps into our system.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. Has the gentleman been informed that this bill does not increase the salary, does not increase the number of employees, does not increase any expenses nor any bureaus?

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to show that it does. If my distinguished friend from Louisiana has that idea of the bill, he never was more mistaken in his life.

I am here to do my duty as a Representative of the Government, 1 of the 435 Members. When I find year by year that the bureaus are increasing, that the institutions of Government are increasing, that the expenses are increasing, that the appropriation bills are coming in regularly, calling for more and more money out of the Treasury, and that the people must be taxed to put that money in the Treasury before it can be taken out, then I find myself thoroughly awake on the proposition, and I carefully study and am going to inspect every bill that comes on this floor that seeks to take more money out of the Treasury and seeks to add one single employee more to the pay rolls of the Government.

I am going to watch and find out where these increases of bureaus come in, and if you will talk with the membership they will tell you that they have not been able to find out how it is enlarged every year. It is enlarged every year by just such bills as this.

I know that it is rather dangerous politically for a Member of the House to oppose a bill that has as many farm organization indorsements as this bill has. It is rather dangerous if he represents an agricultural district, as I do. This bill is indorsed by the representatives of every farm organization. I know that. I have read the indorsements, I have seen their signatures in the report, but that does not deter me one minute from rising here against a growing system of waste and extravagance that means increased taxation to the people of the country.

Let me call your attention to what this bill does. My friend from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] is one of the most distinguished Members of the House. He has had long service here. He pays rather close attention to legislation. He has good ideas and good judgment on many things. I have consulted with him many times—

Mr. ASWELL. The gentleman is not going to cut that out of the RECORD, is he?

Mr. BLANTON. I take his judgment on lots of things. I follow him on everything on earth that is proper. I am going to show him where he has slipped a cog on this bill. He says that it will not cost a dollar more. That was his statement. He says that it will not add an extra employee. That was his statement, and if it was not I want him to deny it now. I shall show him now where he has slipped a cog. I read from subdivision 3 of this bill:

The Department of State shall accredit, in the same manner as a secretary of an embassy or legation of the United States, as agricultural attachés with diplomatic standing, to such countries as the Sec-

retary of Agriculture shall deem advisable, the agricultural commissioners at present representing the Department of Agriculture in foreign countries, and such other agricultural attachés—

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I want now to convince my friend of where he has slipped a cog. The bill does not stop there. It continues:

and such other agricultural attachés as shall be appointed from time to time by the Secretary of Agriculture—

And so forth.

Mr. ASWELL. That does not increase the number at all.

Mr. BLANTON. The Department of State shall accredit such other attachés as shall be appointed from time to time by the Secretary of Agriculture. What does that mean? It means that there are going to be others appointed under the provisions of this bill, and that this legislation is a warrant to pay their salaries and their expenses through the Committee on Appropriations. This is the legislation that is going to warrant that. Without this legislation the appropriation if brought in would be subject to a point of order, and we otherwise could control it in the various appropriation bills.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I am going to yield to the gentleman later. Let me show you something else about this bill. I read now from subdivision (4):

The Secretary of Agriculture may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act \* \* \* and shall have the power to appoint, remove, and fix and pay the compensation of such officers and employees, not in conflict with existing law, and make such expenditures for rent outside the District of Columbia—

That means foreign countries, if you please; that means in Paris, that means in England, that means in China, that means in Japan, that means in every country of the world wherever he sees fit. And he shall—

\* \* \* make such expenditures for rent outside the District of Columbia, printing, telegrams, telephones, law books, books of reference, maps, periodicals, furniture, stationery, office equipment, travel, and subsistence allowances and other supplies and expenses which shall be necessary to the administration of the act in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and as may be appropriated for by Congress.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. We, the Congress, fix subsistence allowances in other bills.

We, the Congress, fix travel pay in other bills; we, the Congress, fix compensation in other bills; but in this bill as to these employees we are leaving it, we are passing the buck, we are transferring it from the Congress to the Secretary of Agriculture to fix the salaries first and then fix travel and subsistence allowance second and then to pay such of these expenses as he wants to in his own discretion.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not willing to do that. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. KETCHAM. In the first place, does the gentleman think there is really any great alarm about the size of an organization, in view of the fact that in 40 years this organization has only developed something like seven men abroad. Is the gentleman alarmed as to the development which may come to agriculture after 40 years—

Mr. BLANTON. It is because Congress has allowed only seven. I know how much this bill means to my friend, and I sympathize with him. This is his pet, and I would like to do him the kindness to vote for it were it not for the fact of taking money out of the pockets of the American people. The gentleman speaks of these farm organizations, their representatives having signed this report, having indorsed it. I want to tell you where I get my instructions from for fighting this bill. Do you remember when the distinguished member of the Republican steering committee [Mr. DARROW] brought in on the floor of this House a bunch of petitions to this Congress which covered all of that large stand there, signed not by these representatives of farmers but by 350,000 actual dirt farmers themselves of the United States. They were the ones I will have back of me, if you please. They brought that petition in here, and Mr. DARROW put it in the RECORD. What was it those farmers told us. They send here a solemn mandate to us and said "Men, we command of you that you shall cut down the expenses of the Government. We demand of you that you stop increasing taxes; we demand of you that you stop increasing

salaries; we demand of you economy in Government." That is what the dirt farmers whom I represent back home have said; that is the kind of mandate they sent to me and to you. I want to tell you I would take their mandate before I will that of their representatives who have signed this report indorsing the bill.

Let me say this to my friends: It is very easy to pass a bill of this kind. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, in whom we all have confidence and whom we all love, brings this bill in here. He is representing the farmers apparently—ostensibly. Nobody else has risen in opposition to it. It is the kind of bill that is expected to be taken up and passed unanimously without reading. About the only opposition we heard was that of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD], who got up and said, "I object to the word 'attaché.' I want that changed to an American word." What do the farmers of the country care about foreign pronunciation of a word? It is money in the bill that is taken out of their pockets with which they are most concerned; yet the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska says that if you change the word "attaché" to some American word, then all right; that he will go out and get his lunch, and thus the bill passes, and the money is taken out. And we go back home to our constituents and they call us to account, and we say that we can not help it; that it was a unanimous report; that if we had gotten up and fought it we could not have stopped it; and they would answer, "Why did not you fight or make an effort?" And we say it would not have done any good; it would have passed anyway. I am here telling you I am going to stand here on this floor and fight such measures that increase taxes, and I do not care if my vote is the only one against it. Sooner or later the people are going to send Representatives here who are going to back me up in my efforts for economy, and you watch and see if they do not do it. I will have some company here sooner or later who are going to fight with me to reduce taxes, because I am going to continue this fight on this floor until it accomplishes something for the people of this country.

I want to show you what is in this appropriation bill we sidetracked yesterday that embraced \$63,349,160. I am for foreign representation in foreign countries. I am for having somebody to represent our interests. I am for having somebody there to look out for the foreign markets; but I want to show you here in this \$63,349,160 appropriation bill that we provide already hundreds of thousands of dollars for just such purposes. Now I am going to yield to my friend, and I want him to get up here and tell you just what happened in the last few days that has caused the Secretary of Commerce to withdraw his opposition from this bill. Tell us, please, what happened. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KETCHAM. May I say I did not ask for the privilege of the floor?

Mr. BLANTON. I did not think the gentleman could tell us, so I shall not insist on yielding to him unless he wants to be yielded to. I will yield to some member of the committee to tell us. Will not some member of the committee get up here and tell us? I am going to yield to the gentleman from Kansas because he rises to enlighten us.

Mr. TINCHER. Well, I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture—

Mr. BLANTON. Tell us just what caused the Secretary of Commerce to withdraw opposition to this bill?

Mr. TINCHER. My understanding is he never had any opposition to the bill, and never having had any he could not withdraw it. If the gentleman knows that the Secretary of Commerce ever objected to the provisions of the bill, I wish he would inform the committee of something that we never heard of.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished gentleman—the author of the bill—be granted permission to revise his remarks in which he referred to any opposition that the Secretary of Commerce formerly had to this bill, so he will be consistent with the stand taken by the gentleman from Kansas. I say that because he did refer to opposition. I did not bring it in.

Mr. TINCHER. I understand the reference was to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He had two bills here, and there was some difference between the two committees concerning the bill. What you are talking about is Secretary Hoover objecting to this bill, as I understand it.

Mr. BLANTON. Has there been any objection from the Department of Commerce?

Mr. KETCHAM. I have had no communication from the Secretary of Commerce with reference to the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce any objection to it?

Mr. KETCHAM. I will not answer as to that.

Mr. BLANTON. I will not ask you to answer if you do not want to. But I want to show you what is in this Commerce Department appropriation bill for our foreign representation. I want to show you that we already have foreign representation with respect to the marketing of our various products. I read on page 46 of the appropriation bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, that we argued yesterday in the House, the following:

Commercial attachés: For commercial attachés, to be appointed \* \* \* by the Secretary of Commerce, \$241,000.

Then the next paragraph, "Promoting commerce, Europe and other areas, \$385,000."

Then, further, "District and cooperative office service," if you please, \$166,000 more.

Do you know that every bit of this money that is in this appropriation bill has been made mandatory on the Committee on Appropriations to put in this bill because we passed just such legislation as this heretofore? From time to time some such bill has been brought in here as is brought in now, and we pass it. We have sought the paths of least resistance, and have said nothing and let it pass. Now, we have to pass appropriations to respond to that system.

Now, here is something else in this \$63,349,160 appropriation bill: "Promoting commerce, South and Central America," \$243,000. And again, "Promoting commerce in the Far East," \$213,000 more. Then for "Export Industries, to enable the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to investigate and report on domestic as well as foreign problems relating to the production, distribution, and marketing in so far as they relate to the important export industries of the United States," and so forth, \$582,550 more in this bill. Then for "Raw-material investigations," \$50,780. Then for "Collecting statistics: For securing information, \* \* \* reports of stocks of baled cotton in the United States, and of the domestic and foreign consumption of cotton"—get that, gentlemen—"the domestic and foreign consumption of cotton," \$805,000 more in this bill that you are to pass to-morrow.

Mr. GARBER. What page is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. BLANTON. Page 55—\$805,000 more, if you please.

Do you know what happens when we have our Secretary of State give the standing of an attaché to an individual in a foreign country? Do you know what happens? You are conferring on that individual social prestige. We already have our diplomatic attachés, and we already have our commercial attachés, and now we will have our agricultural attachés. They have all got to be socially classified and have a social status in these foreign countries. They have got to know which one can go ahead of the others. They have got to know exactly what kind of clothes they have got to wear on certain occasions. They have got to know just where to go at the table when they go out to dine; that is, which seat they are to occupy, how far they can go down the table, and where they have to stop, whom they have to follow, and whom they have to precede. Those are some of the main duties that they perform.

I want to cut out all that monkey business. We are paying for it with huge sums of money every year. That is what was in the minds of those 350,000 actual dirt farmers of the country when they sent that box-car petition demanding economy to the chairman of your Republican steering committee. That is what they had in mind. Do you think you can fool the farmers back home? They are the hardest class of people in the world to fool.

Last summer I drove over a good part of the United States in my car, and finally landed at home in Texas. I drove back another way to Washington through the country. I went through quite a number of States. I stopped along the road and talked to the farmers. I wanted to see whether the farmers in other States were any different from the farmers of Texas. I wanted to get their ideas. I wanted to find out what they are thinking about with respect to their Government business. I did not merely stop the farmers, but I stopped along the road and talked with the laboring men; I stopped in cities and towns and talked to members of chambers of commerce; I talked to the business men in their places of business. I found that the one central idea that is uppermost in the minds of every individual, from farmer to banker, if you please, is economy in Government business. There must be more economy in it. We must use common sense in the passage of legislation.

We must use more common sense in the appropriation of public funds out of the Public Treasury. And I came back to Washington with one resolve uppermost in my heart, and that was that I was going to work and stand here and fight for economy as I had never fought for it before.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly, to my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I have just been informed that the gentleman, while I was out taking my coffee, had assaulted the only champion he has on the floor here with reference to his position on this bill. Now, I wonder if the gentleman would be kind enough to yield to me, from his possession of all the time, two or three minutes to speak on my position with respect to this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I have taken up a good deal of the time. How much time have I used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied 27 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. That is more than I intended to do, and I know that the gentleman from Nebraska could not damage my speech by an interspersion, and so I am going to reserve the balance of my time and yield to the gentleman such time as he desires, and will then finish my speech later. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. As long as it takes me to say it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I think the time should be allotted in an orderly manner. The chairman of the committee in charge of the bill has the right to yield time.

Mr. BLANTON. Would the gentleman from Nebraska mind waiting until I get through?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Not at all. I will grant any reasonable request.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will finish my remarks first because I was almost through.

Gentlemen, I want to appeal to you on this matter. Let us not just take it for granted that this bill is necessary. I am just as good a friend of the farmer as you are. I represent as many farmers as any man in this House, without any exception. I represent 314,314 people. Did you know that? And most of them are farmers. Can any of you beat that? Why should I not be just as much their friend as you are? Do not let us take it for granted that this bill is a necessity and must pass because a few farmers' organizations have indorsed it. Lots of farm representatives look at something and think, "That is something coming out of the Treasury; what do we care? There might be some good in it, and it can not do us any harm, so we will just pass it." But taxation and economy are the questions we must keep uppermost in mind.

I beseech every one of you to stop and consider whether this bill is a necessity. Here is your chance to stop these encroachments of Government bureaus; here is your chance to stop extensions abroad. They say charity begins at home. Let us do something first for the farmers at home, while this is to do something abroad. If you will get the \$63,349,160 appropriation bill which is to come up to-morrow and which we debated yesterday, you will find that we have plenty of foreign representatives abroad to find markets for our farm products and commerce. Let us hesitate a while, study this bill, and see whether we can not do without it. Now is the time to stop these encroachments and these enlargements and expenses of government. Now is the time to save expense for the people. Here is your opportunity to reduce taxes. What are you going to do about it? Just seek the path of least resistance? It is a lot easier to vote for it than it is to vote against it. It would be lots easier for me to get up here and vote for the bill, and I would make more friends if I voted for all these bills here in Congress than if I fight them. It takes hard work for me to dig up the facts about bills, and to do that I have to stay awake at night when some of you are asleep.

And the newspapers! I know how you feel about them. If you get up and fight a bill, the newspapers will attack you. Why, did you know that any man on earth who makes a fight and tries to accomplish something for the people of the country will be barked at? You can not keep a dog from barking at you, can you? But he does not hurt you so long as he does not bite you. I do not mind being barked at. It does not hurt you for the newspapers to say unkind things about you; it does not hurt you unless what they say is true. Ah, if you will conduct yourself in life properly and walk the straight and narrow line so that what they say about you can not hurt you because it is not true, you are impervious to those assaults. The newspapers do not hurt me because their criticisms are

untrue; nor do they hurt me with my people at home because my constituents know me. They may hurt me some with strangers, but I am going to do my duty here in this House regardless of the barkings, snarlings, and snappings.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD].

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] desire recognition now?

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman if he desires to take more time.

Mr. BLANTON. Unless something unusual comes up, I do not want any more time, but I merely reserved the balance of my time out of an abundance of caution.

Mr. HAUGEN. What is the gentleman's disposition now? Does he want to go on?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I rise in opposition to this bill. I shall not discuss it along the lines of my distinguished friend from Texas. I would like, if I could, to let every good thing that he uttered in opposition to the bill be understood to be indorsed by me.

I simply rise to call attention to the high type of statesmanship of the gentlemen on this side of the aisle at this time in connection with this bill. I am not going to talk politics; I am going to talk with reference to this bill.

This bill provides for a vast army of—well, the bill calls them attachés, to be connected with our foreign legations and embassies for the purpose of gathering information of value to our American agriculturists. I have asked the question of the chairman of the committee presenting the report, and he tells me that as amended the bill will provide that the appointments be made under the civil service. Well, I presume every Democratic Congressman here present understands what that means. For the enlightenment of you gentlemen on the administration side, let me tell you what the present operation of the civil service means. For instance, we poor Democratic Congressmen will be notified that a postmaster is to be appointed at Jones Crossroads; we are informed that there are three eligibles. Then we are in doubt what to do. We would like to recommend the best one of those three, the one who would administer the office for the best interests of the people surrounding that post office, and yet under the civil-service program it is very dangerous for us to do so, because the situation is about this: The best qualifications an applicant for a post office may have is positive proof that he is a Republican in good standing. [Applause.] And, of course, no righteous Democrat could certify in favor of that kind of an applicant as his first choice. When we certify in behalf of some fellow who has been rightly reared and is a Democrat we thereby run the risk of destroying all chances he might have for holding the post office.

So I am asking the gentlemen in charge of this bill to tell me if they will—and then perhaps I might vote for it—if they would tell me that under the rules for the appointment of these attachés—and I do not want any good Democrat to ever wear that nasty foreign name—that a Democrat will sometimes have a show for his white alley. [Laughter.]

Now, here comes the profound statesmanship of the gentlemen on this side. Most of them intend to vote for this bill. They would like to say simply because it is in harmony with agricultural legislation, but I will let you folks on the other side into a secret. They are not voting for it for that reason only. They positively know that one year from this day these appointments will be controlled not by the present administration, but by a Democratic administration. [Applause.] And, oh, what a beautiful bunch of fat patronage that will be for us boys over here. [Laughter.] You know everybody loves to get a foreign appointment of some kind, and if he can get a foreign appointment with a French word attached to it, all the better. [Laughter.] Just think of the great flocks of worthy and hungry Democrats who, under the provisions of this bill, may be appointed by the new administration to go over the sea and wear the proud title of a foreign attaché to an embassy of ours over there and to draw the fat salary which a liberal Democratic Secretary of Agriculture is going to attach to each one of these appointments. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Do you not want to hear any more of that? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Nebraska the Chair asked the committee to be in order.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Ah! Oh, well, let it go.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY].

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, has the chairman disposed of all his time to Members who are not on the committee?

Mr. HAUGEN. I have a number of requests, and so far I have not had any requests from members of the committee.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I do not want to make a speech and I do not care about it, because I am going to vote for the bill, but Mr. ASWELL, the ranking member of the committee on this side, wants some time, and I understand the chairman has disposed of all the time to Members who are not on the committee.

Mr. LOWREY. I yield my five minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL].

Mr. ASWELL. Oh, no; I do not want that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN] made a very interesting and informing speech yesterday in regard to the increase of our foreign commerce and the value of the commercial attachés abroad. I recommend that you read it if you did not hear it. The gentleman who introduced this bill, or who first discussed the bill, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM], also made an interesting speech, calling attention to the great importance and the imperative demand just now for increasing our foreign market for agricultural products.

Everybody knows that American export trade is largely dependent on agriculture. Under normal conditions about 55 per cent of all our exports are in agricultural products. We export about one-fifth of our wheat crop and from 60 to 70 per cent of our cotton crop. We export very little corn as corn, but we export annually about one and three-quarter billion pounds of meat products from the animals to which our corn has been fed.

This year wheat and cotton, especially, have "hit the bottom." Wheat prices have been about equal to the pre-war average, with the cost of production 50 per cent higher than the pre-war cost. Cotton prices have been higher than the pre-war average, but the cost of production has been considerably higher still. We have sold at an average loss of from 3 to 4 cents a pound.

In this connection it is interesting to note that last year we raised 867,598,000 bushels of wheat and exported 164,691,565 bushels, a little less than one-fifth of it. This year we raised 785,741,000 bushels and exported 98,524,405 bushels, about one-eighth of it. The exportation last year was about equal in bushels to the average exportation since 1890, but was several points lower in percentage of the crop. This year there is a heavy falling off both in percentage and in number of bushels exported. It is obvious that if the exportation had held up this year the price also would have held up, and the wheat farmers would not now be in such desperate straits.

The same applies to cotton, except that the figures are more striking. Last year our cotton crop was 9,761,817 bales. We exported 6,113,813, about 65 per cent of it. This year we raised 10,081,000 bales and exported 5,279,165, about 52 per cent of it. Here again it is perfectly clear that the cotton farmer is hard pressed as a direct result of the failure of his foreign markets.

And cotton has been the backbone of our foreign trade. It is the one item which over a period of 100 years has turned the balance of trade in our favor. Please let me quote the following from Cotton News of April 1:

Had cotton been eliminated from our trade balances from the inception of the Nation down to the beginning of this century, America would have remained a debtor nation during that entire period. Even as it was, with cotton doing yeoman service for our exports, we remained a debtor nation until 1874. From 1790 to that year the balance of trade was uniformly against us, computed by the average of decades, except during the decade of 1840-1849, for which period there was a favorable balance of something less than \$10,000,000. The average balance against us during three-quarters of a century ran from \$4,000,000 in 1820-1829 to \$92,000,000 in the years subsequent to the Civil War. In the years from 1790 to 1893, 103 years, the balance was against us 73 years and in our favor 30 years.

In the decades from 1874 to 1914 the balance was in our favor on an average from \$80,000,000 in 1885-1889 to \$666,000,000 in the year 1908. In the year immediately prior to the Great War the balance in our favor was \$470,000,000; but in this same year even the export value of raw and manufactured cotton was \$661,000,000.

#### WHAT COTTON HAS DONE FOR US

It was not until 1895 that the balance in our favor ever ran as high as \$150,000,000; but the value of our cotton exports passed \$200,000,000 in 1870 and has never been as low as \$150,000,000 from that day to this. The export value of the staple, raw and manufactured, reached the enormous total of \$1,538,000,000 in 1920.

Since the beginning of the present century there have been several years, conspicuously those of the war period, when we would have remained a creditor nation even had cotton values not been credited on our side of the ledger. From 1790 to 1910 the final total balance in our favor for the entire period was \$8,200,000,000. In the period from 1800 to 1914—114 years, it will be observed, as against 120—our raw and manufactured cotton's export value to the Nation was \$16,400,000,000, or exactly double. The point is that had cotton been eliminated we would have been debtor to the world by \$8,200,000,000 in 1914 instead of being creditor to that same amount. And this, it will be remembered, takes into no account whatever the wealth that has accrued to us in consequences of our domestic production, manufacture, and consumption of cotton.

Why are we losing our foreign trade with the resulting loss on American farmers? First, because Europe is not in condition to buy. Before the war Germany used annually two and a quarter million bales of American cotton. She is now using less than 1,000,000 bales. Before the war France used one and a half million bales of American cotton. She is now using about 1,000,000 bales. England used nearly 5,000,000 bales. She is now using a little more than 3,000,000.

If America had done her part in making peace as she did her part in making war, she would have saved already within these five short years hundreds of millions of dollars to the American farmer. And that is only the beginning.

For the most serious phase of the situation is this: What Europe is able to buy she is buying as largely as possible from other markets, not from America. We are losing not only our immediate sales but we are losing our trade affiliations on which sales in future years must be based. Before the war England bought 75 per cent of her cotton from us; last year she bought 70 per cent. Before the war France bought 78 per cent from us; last year she bought 74 per cent. Before the war the United States produced 72 per cent of the world's export cotton supply. Last year she produced 68 per cent.

Here again this is only the beginning. England is making tremendous efforts to develop within her own colonies and dominions sufficient agricultural production to supply the Empire. For this she is not to be blamed. France and Japan are following suit. Really, Germany is the only considerable manufacturing country that is not following suit. She has no colonies.

Please let me cite again some recent press notices.

Here is what India is doing, taken from the New York World of February 26:

#### UNITED STATES COTTON THREATENED—GAINS IN INDIA'S PRODUCTION MENACE AMERICAN CONTROL

LONDON, February 26.—A serious threat to American control of the world's raw cotton is indicated in recent figures on Indian cotton production. For the five years before the war India exported an average of 50,000 to 60,000 bales to England. Last year the total was 275,000, and this year, according to figures just issued, it will be 300,000.

A report by the secretary of the board of agriculture says the world will be emancipated from American monopoly of raw cotton within 10 years, largely due to Indian production.

This from South Africa, found in the New York Times for March 23:

#### COTTON IN SOUTH AFRICA—PREPARING FOR LARGE EXTENSION OF ITS CULTIVATION THERE

So marked has the interest in cotton growing in South Africa become that the Empire Cotton Growing Corporation has offered to pay the expenses of three specially trained officers to help develop the industry there. Cotton production in that part of the world has been increasing steadily since 1919, according to W. E. Vaughn, jr., secretary to the trade commission in Johannesburg, who, in a report to the Department of Commerce, says that during the 1922-23 season the crop amounted to 2,400,000 pounds of lint. This is about 4,800 bales of 500 pounds each, compared with 1,096,182 pounds for the previous year.

"It is estimated that the area under cotton cultivation in South Africa at present," the report continues, "is approximately 20,000 acres. Practically all of the cotton is exported. It has been officially announced that a bill will be introduced in the House of Commons early in the forthcoming session to obtain parliamentary sanction for the construction of a railway line near Somkele to the Pongola River in Zululand. The proposed line will open a quarter of a million acres of good cotton soil in that country."

In a recent address a cotton expert for Eastern Transvaal said that South African lint is of good quality and regarded highly by manufacturers in Great Britain, France, and Belgium. He believes that the

cotton experimental stage in South Africa has passed. The country is free to-day from two of the worst cotton pests, and there are from 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 acres of virgin land suitable for the production of high-class cotton. The biggest factor, however, is the lack of sufficient labor of the right kind.

This is from the New York Evening Journal, February 21, in reference to Australia:

#### AUSTRALIA GROWING COTTON

Australia, which has been able to grow limited quantities of good staple cotton, is setting out to raise 1,000,000 bales a year, about 10 per cent of the American output in recent years. The area under cultivation in Queensland has increased from 166 acres in 1920 to more than 100,000 acres in 1924. Moreover, between 20,000 and 30,000 acres will be planted in New South Wales this year.

The natural advantages for cotton growing are with the Southern States, whose leadership ought to persist through the years. The increasing competition, however, serves new notice on the cotton planters to improve their technique. More intensive cultivation under scientific methods could unquestionably lower the average cost of production. As long as the consuming public must pay tribute to the waste of ill-guided and unintelligent farming methods, America's virtual monopoly in raising cotton will be increasingly challenged.

And here is the rest of the British Empire:

#### NEW BRITISH COTTON FIELDS

A new plan for increasing the cotton-producing area of the British Empire is outlined in the announcement from Bagdad of a system of irrigation projected for the Djalala Valley, which will add 1,500,000 acres to the Mesopotamian cotton fields. This undertaking is in the nature of an experiment. Cotton is now grown in limited quantities in Mesopotamia, and if the Djalala region project is profitable other lands of the Euphrates Valley in upper Mesopotamia and Syria will be brought under cultivation by a similar system of irrigation.

The interest to the world in this undertaking lies in the fact that for at least 20 years the British have been endeavoring to find a source of unending raw material for the great English cotton mills. This search has had the support and encouragement of the Government. It has resulted in numerous expensive and often unsuccessful experiments. It has, however, brought about an increased cotton production in India and the development of cotton growing in Australia, the upper Nile Valley, the Sudan, and the tropical regions of Africa.

Early this year the British colonial office laid before the House its plan for the expenditure of \$40,000,000 in the development of cotton production in Uganda, tropical Africa. The experimental stage there passed when a production of 90,000 bales of 400 pounds was reached. It is estimated that the potential production is 1,000,000 bales. The appropriation is to be expended in railways which will bring the crop to the sea coast.

Last year the British Government undertook the farther development of the upper Nile cotton region by building a railway into the Gash Valley and extending its system of irrigation so as to include about 100,000 more acres of cotton land. The cotton area in the Blue Nile and Kassala districts will be increased by about 500,000 acres. The British Government expects to acquire also 5,000,000 acres of fine cotton-growing land beyond the Sudan border through an agreement with Abyssinia.

It is to these already partially developed African fields, to India, Queensland, and the experimental fields in Mesopotamia that the British cotton industry will look for its raw material.

I wish you would get that, please, 1,500,000 acres being added in Mesopotamia now besides the great increase in cotton production in Africa, Australia, and so forth.

These are very large figures. Think of England's bringing in at two strokes 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 acres of cotton land and think of what it would mean to America to lose our cotton trade abroad. If that is going to be done in England—and nobody can object to England's right to do it—if England is going to make her own cotton markets and raise her cotton in her own dependencies, it means we have got to enlarge our cotton trade elsewhere and we have got to find the commerce abroad that will correct the situation with reference to the exportation of our American product.

There are at least two other countries which are coming to compete with us largely in cotton production. The New York Journal of Commerce, March 31, says that the Brazilian crop this year is estimated at 1,000,000 bales; and our Department of Commerce says that the Chinese crop is estimated at from 2,500,000 to 4,000,000 bales. Here are two countries which a few years ago produced almost no cotton, now producing at least a third as much as we produce.

What is true of cotton is true also of wheat. Take note of the following. If I remember correctly this clipping is from the New York Times of March 23:

#### OUTLOOK FOR WORLD'S GRAIN CROPS IN 1924—DECREASE FORESHADOWED IN NORTH AMERICA OFFSET BY INCREASE IN OTHER CONTINENTS

Reviewing the agricultural situation in the world outside of the United States, the monthly bulletin of the Department of Agriculture points out that in the Northern Hemisphere reports of fall seedings have been received from nine countries, including the United States and Canada, and that these reports show decreased acreage of about 8 per cent in the 1924 crops. In the case of rye there is a 15 per cent decrease in the United States, offset by increase in Czechoslovakia, Sweden, Poland, and Rumania. The Argentine wheat harvest, practically completed in January, is now estimated at 259,000,000 bushels, comparing with the final estimate of 189,000,000 for the season 1922-23.

The Chilean wheat crop is estimated at 25,000,000 bushels, as against 23,000,000 last year. In Australia the new wheat crop is now estimated at 125,800,000 bushels; the harvest of the previous season was 109,300,000. The opinion is expressed that at least three-fourths of the available Russian surplus of wheat and rye has been exported; a total figure of 40,000,000 is expected. Credence is given to the reports of grain shortage in parts of Russia, indicating that the Government requests for export may have unduly reduced the food supplies of the Russian people.

This is from the Washington Star:

#### SEES CANADA LEADING IN EXPORTING WHEAT—UNITED STATES SOON TO PRODUCE ONLY ENOUGH FOR HOME NEEDS, SAYS HERBERT HOLT

(Special dispatch to the Star)

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, February 29.—Canada will soon have a virtual monopoly of the export trade in wheat from North America, according to Sir Herbert Holt, president of the Royal Bank of Canada.

"Present tendencies in the United States," said Sir Herbert, "indicate that within the next few years the Republic will produce only enough wheat for its domestic needs, leaving Canada, already the leading exporter of the world, as the sole exporter of wheat from North America.

"Canada's wheat exports to the world have increased more than 2,000 per cent since 1900. In that year the Dominion shipped out 9,359,640 bushels of wheat. In the year ending August 1, 1923, Canada's exports of wheat amounted to 299,631,000 bushels."

And this is from the New York Sun of March 21:

#### JAPAN AND CHINA BUY MUCH CANADIAN WHEAT

Japan and China are becoming large consumers of wheat and flour, and Canada is getting a good share of the business in these commodities. Pre-war exports of Canadian wheat to Asia averaged 154,000 bushels, but last year's exports were 2,610,000 bushels. Pre-war exports of Canadian flour to Asia averaged 83,000 barrels but last year reached 758,000 barrels.

These clippings might be multiplied indefinitely. They mean that the time has passed when America has a monopoly on agricultural production and can ride her farmers with heavy protective tariffs to enrich her manufacturers. Unless we mean to sacrifice our greatest and most vital industry, agriculture, we must take steps and take them immediately to put the American farmer in position to compete. With the wisest sort of statesmanship it will take several years to do that.

Meanwhile it is urgently important that we do something to catch back the markets that our own folly has set slipping from us. We may not be able to save the situation as regards Great Britain. Rather, it is pretty certain to become at no distant date a question of competing with her for the continental trade. That is largely a question of financing. The Continent is bankrupt. Its trade now is being financed from England, and England herself is almost bankrupt. The United States has absorbed the world's gold supply. If she uses it intelligently she can save her farmers and save herself and save the world. If she does not use it intelligently the world will finally save itself, but the American farmer will meanwhile be ruined, immediately and permanently, and America herself will be humiliated and injured in a corresponding degree.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have on several occasions since the Sixty-eighth Congress convened called attention to the nation-wide financial distress that prevails among the agricultural classes. I have suggested the importance of the speedy enactment of remedial legislation. I have emphasized the fact that there can be no worth while, enduring or nation-wide prosperity unless the agricultural classes participate in that prosperity. I have also pointed out the imperative necessity of enlarging our export markets for our surplus farm products. I had hoped that before this time Congress would have had an opportunity to consider a legislative program having for its object the amelioration of this nation-wide agricultural anemia. But the Committee on Agri-

culture has reported to the House no general and comprehensive agricultural relief program. I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and, of course, have no desire to criticize the committee for the delay in reporting out bills that have been introduced and which are designed to remove the handicap under which agriculture has so long and so unnecessarily labored. I understand the committee is working hard on these bills and is making an earnest and honest effort to reconcile differences and overcome objections to several of the pending bills. I favor a legislative program which will, in so far as possible, rehabilitate American agriculture, enlarge and extend our markets for our surplus products, and in every reasonable manner contribute to the alleviation of the present intolerable conditions.

I am heartily in favor of the bill that we are now considering, the first important agricultural measure, because it is a step in the right direction and looks to the enlargement of our foreign markets. One trouble with the United States is that we have been content for a hundred years to exploit our own people, develop our own natural resources, trade with one another, and swap dollars with our fellow citizens. That policy, through shortsighted, was excusable until our natural resources were developed, but we have now reached the point of national development where it is absolutely necessary for us to go out and make a real fight for the markets of the world.

May I respectfully suggest to the President and to the present administration that the War Finance Corporation will not and can not afford the American farmers the relief to which they are entitled? The farmers of this Nation are not asking for more credit; they as a class are not seeking to borrow more money; but they need and demand enlarged markets and better prices for the commodities they produce. For several years the farmer has not been able to sell his commodities at a price equal to the cost of production, much less at a price that would yield a profit.

The late war made this Nation the financial mistress of the world. By reason of this preeminence we should and must make a conquest of the world markets if we are to establish and maintain our agricultural, industrial, and commercial supremacy. But we can not win these markets without a struggle. The European nations, particularly Great Britain, are exerting tremendous energies to repossess the markets that we captured during the World War. Canada within the last year has made a tremendous encroachment upon the foreign-trade territory of the United States, especially in Europe and the Orient. By a shortsighted legislative policy the United States has contributed to the growth and power of Canada as a competitor in the wheat markets of the world.

The American farmers have awakened to a realization that Canada is now and will continue to be our strongest competitor in the wheat markets of the world. Those in charge of our national affairs, aided by the newspapers and periodicals, have kept the American farmers in the dark as to the agricultural situation and have held out to them the false hope that high prices for our farm products could be obtained by the imposition of high tariff duties. No greater fallacy has ever deceived or deluded a confiding public. A high tariff will afford a certain degree of protection when levied on commodities of which we do not produce an exportable surplus, but such a tariff is impotent and powerless to increase artificially the domestic price of a commodity such as wheat, of which we produce annually an exceedingly large exportable surplus. It is fundamental that the domestic price of wheat is regulated and determined by the export price and the export price is determined in the open markets of the world where our wheat enters into competition with wheat from Canada, Argentina, Australia, India, North Africa, Turkey in Europe, Turkey in Asia, Russia, and the Balkan States.

I grant you that in the case of wool or any other commodity, the production of which is only about half of what we need for our domestic manufactures, a high tariff may automatically, under certain conditions, increase the market price, because we do not produce a surplus of wool and each year must import large quantities of it to meet our domestic needs.

No one who is familiar with the situation and who has given the wheat problem any careful attention will claim that the tariff on wheat has any effect whatever on the price of the hard winter wheat or red wheat produced in the United States, and these varieties constitute the great part of our wheat production. However, it is claimed that the price of high protein in wheat (northern spring wheat) is enhanced by the tariff which excludes from our market the high-protein wheats (or northern spring wheat) grown in Canada. But the quantity of high-protein wheat grown in the United States is negligible—in fact, so small as not to materially influence market prices.

In other words, the producer of high-protein wheat in the United States receives a few cents per bushel more premium for his high-protein wheat in comparison with the price of domestic low-protein wheat. The Canadian wheat contains a higher protein content than the great bulk of wheat raised in the United States, and by blending the two grades some of the wheat which is rather low in gluten can be used to make a stronger flour. If the use of Canadian wheat for domestic milling purposes in the United States were prohibited entirely, I grant you that the effect would probably be to increase the premium of high-protein wheat over low-protein wheat, but this spread may result, not necessarily from the increase in the price of the high-protein wheat, but from a decrease in the price of low-protein wheat. We do not produce in the United States a sufficient quantity of high-protein wheat to meet the needs of the American mills for milling purposes.

At an early date it is my purpose to discuss every phase of the wheat problem and every element that enters into the agricultural situation. I shall demonstrate that there is no overproduction of wheat in the United States or in the world; that so-called diversified farming will not cure the economic ills with which the American farmers are suffering; that while high-tariff duties will automatically increase the domestic price of any commodity of which we do not produce a surplus, such duties will not and can not enhance the price of a commodity like wheat, of which we produce a large exportable surplus and which surplus must be sold in the open markets of the world in competition with wheat from all wheat-producing nations; that the increase of 12 cents per bushel in the tariff duty on wheat has not, will not, and can not increase the price of wheat in the United States or elsewhere, and such increase is in no way beneficial to the American farmer. These and correlated subjects I propose to discuss in detail from time to time, but in the limited time at my disposal this afternoon I desire to call your attention to some of the conditions with which the American farmer stands face to face in the markets of the world and which conditions vitally affect the interest and welfare of American agriculture.

I desire this afternoon to discuss briefly one particular phase of the wheat problem. Since we became a Nation we have lived "next-door neighbor" to Canada, with only an imaginary line separating the Dominion from the United States. Our Nation has had such a remarkable industrial and commercial development and we have enjoyed during the last century such unprecedented prosperity that we have become imbued with the belief that our prosperity would continue forever, that there would always be a demand in the markets of the world for our surplus products, and that the world would continue to come to the United States for grain and foodstuffs with which to satisfy the hunger of mankind.

We have grown so rapidly in wealth, influence, and power that we have failed to observe the growth of our neighbor on the north, until now we are awakening to a realization that Canada has become the greatest and most dangerous competitor of the United States in the grain markets of the world. And may I add that by shortsighted legislative policies we have materially contributed to the growth and the development of that rival that now threatens to drive us from the market which we have in the past dominated and controlled. We have been asleep at the switch and even now the scales have not fallen from the eyes of many men in public and private life who do not realize that the Canadian wheat farmers are slowly but surely driving the American wheat farmers from the world markets.

I want you and the American people to look this situation squarely in the face, because unless we do correctly analyze the situation and adopt measures to correct the existing conditions, the world markets will soon slip from our hands once and forever.

I desire, therefore, to call your attention to the character of the competition from Canadian sources which the American farmers must "go up against" in the world markets.

If the agricultural classes in the United States are compelled to battle with an adversary for our just proportion of the world markets, it is well for us to learn all we can about the giant that threatens our economic life to the end that we may arm ourselves to meet and overcome the foe. For this reason I call your attention to some interesting features relating to the competition which so seriously threatens our trade in the markets of the world. I desire to hold up this Canadian menace in its true light so we may correctly understand the situation and devise ways and means to correct it. I am forced to relate some unpleasant facts, but they are truthful facts which we should know and consider if we really desire to remedy the present disagreeable situation.

The flour-milling industry has attained its greatest efficiency in the United States, and without a tariff wall much of the flour that is now being ground in Canadian mills would be ground in American mills. This would afford labor for thousands of our citizens and give us the bran, shorts, and other by-products which are badly needed by our farmers for feeding purposes.

This would not affect the price of American wheat or American flour, because practically all of this flour, whether ground in Canada or in the United States, is exported to Europe and other foreign countries. If flour ground from Canadian wheat is exported to Europe, it makes no difference, so far as the price of wheat and flour in the United States is concerned, whether it is ground in Canada or in the United States, because, wherever ground, it sells in competition with our wheat and flour in the open markets of the world.

Until recent years the flour-milling industry was not highly developed in Canada, but largely as a result of our high tariff laws the Canadians are each year grinding more of their wheat into flour and shipping the flour to Europe instead of shipping the wheat. May I call your attention to the tremendous competition we have from Canada in the world markets?

By our high tariff we are building up in Canada a great milling industry. The milling industry in Canada has made wonderful strides during the past 10 years and has every promise of prosperity before it. At the present time there are 1,250 flour mills in Canada capable of producing 40,000,000 barrels of flour a year. In 1923 the production was approximately 20,000,000 barrels, 11,000,000 barrels of which were exported. In other words, only about 22 per cent of the total possible production will be needed for domestic consumption. If the Canadian mills should be operated to full capacity, thereby producing 40,000,000 barrels of flour annually, 31,200,000 barrels would be for export and would compete with American flour in the open markets of the world, tariff or no tariff.

By making an intelligent and aggressive fight in the world markets the Canadians have been able to maintain the export demand on a level with that of the war period, and in 1923 the export demand for Canadian flour was in excess of the demand during the war. No one can study the statistics in relation to the flour exports from Canada and escape the conviction that the Canadian mills are forging ahead and are rapidly overtaking the exports of American mills, which have always been Canada's most serious competitor in the foreign markets.

The exports of flour from the United States and Canada in 1913, 1916, and 1923 were as follows:

Year	From Canada	From United States
1913.....	4,894,000	12,278,000
1916.....	7,900,000	14,379,000
1923.....	11,200,000	14,900,000

That is to say, in 1923 the exports of flour from the United States were 2,622,000 barrels more than in 1913, while in 1923 the exports of flour from Canada were 6,306,000 barrels more than in 1913. In 1923 the exports of flour from Canada were only 3,700,000 barrels less than the export from the United States. In other words, the exports of flour from the United States in 1923 were only 21 per cent in excess of the exports in 1913, while the exports of flour from Canada in 1923 increased nearly 150 per cent. These statistics emphasize the remarkable growth of Canadian exports, while the flour exports from the United States for the past few years remained almost stationary. Let us see how the Canadians themselves look at the problem we are considering.

Mr. F. C. Cornell, secretary of the Canadian Millers' Association, said in a recent interview:

The trade reports no diminishing in the flour orders during the last month, and the very low price at which they are now selling to many important countries has brought much business to Canadian mills. This market is a highly specialized one and at all times needs close watching. European countries, by reason of military expediency, are encouraging flour milling at home and the importation of wheat instead of flour. The Canadian millers' most serious competitor, therefore, is Canadian wheat. There is also, of course, a competition of United States, Australian, and Argentine mills.

Canadian mills ship to more than 80 different countries and most of them take no wheat, getting all their bread requirements in the form of flour. Looking to the future, Canadian millers foresee no obstacle likely to hinder the steady growing of the Canadian flour-milling industry, and there are many who predict that the Dominion

is rapidly taking the foremost place in the world as a producer of flour. Inland freight-rate structure gives a material preference to the movement of wheat to the seaboard as against flour. Canadian millers are strongly urging Canadian railways in the interest of the industry and the welfare of Canada to correct this handicap. American millers, on a more favorable rate structure for flour, are turning their mills to grinding Canadian wheat in bond. It is hoped that an adjustment of freight rates will remedy this situation.

Of course, it is understood that the Canadian wheat that is milled in bond in Minneapolis, Buffalo, and other American cities is not consumed in the United States and does not enter into competition with our domestic wheat or flour, but in passing through the United States is stopped in transit long enough to be milled into flour and then exported to European or other world markets. The Canadian wheat which is milled in bond constitutes the greater part of Canadian wheat that crosses the international boundary to the United States.

I call attention to the Western Canada Flour Mills Co. (Ltd.), which has mills in the prairie Provinces of Brandon, Calgary, Edmonton, and St. Boniface, and in Ontario at Goderich and in British Columbia at Victoria. The mills at St. Boniface, Calgary, and Goderich are grinding extensively for the export trade. Recently Andrew Kelly, president of this company, gave out an interview in which he said:

A very satisfactory feature of the milling trade at the present time is the keen demand for Canadian flour for export. These inquiries from European countries are more numerous this year than we have ever known before. Many inquiries with reference to possible supplies from Canada are being received from new sources in Europe by the Canadian Millers' Association, by boards of trade, and by other bodies, as well as by individual milling companies, showing that these buyers are in the market to take our product. They do not seem to have any insuperable difficulty in arranging for necessary funds to make these purchases. They have large credits in New York and are ordering our flour and paying for it. Our mills have been shipping steadily and expect to continue. All our flour mills are running night and day to capacity. Of the output of our St. Boniface mill, about 60 per cent is for export, and from the Goderich mill the per cent is nearly the same.

It will be observed that there is a keen demand for Canadian flour for export and that inquiries are more numerous this year than ever before. It also seems that the foreign nations that are buying Canadian wheat have no trouble in arranging for the necessary funds with which to make the purchases, and these foreign customers have large credits in New York City and are buying Canadian flour and paying for it. Everyone familiar with the world movements of wheat and flour knows that the facts are as stated by this astute Canadian business man. If these foreign nations have money on deposit in New York City with which to finance the purchase of Canadian wheat and flour, why can not that trade be diverted to the United States and the money used to purchase American wheat and flour? The explanation is obvious. The Canadian wheat growers are fighting the American wheat growers in the open markets of the world and are rapidly winning the fight. The Canadians realize that they must sell their wheat in the open markets of the world, and they have organized their forces, planned their campaigns, and have gone into the world markets and are there getting the trade that in years gone by came to America. Every week the Canadian wheat growers increase their sales in practically every world wheat market, and every week they are encroaching on the world trade of the American farmers and are winning our customers away from us.

Mr. LOWREY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOZIER. I will.

Mr. LOWREY. I call the gentleman's attention to a statement I made yesterday. It seems that Germany wanted 50,000,000 bushels of our wheat this last year, and they could not get it because we did not make the credit with them so that they could get it.

Mr. LOZIER. The gentleman from Mississippi is quite correct.

Moreover, the Canadians are sending their trade scouts all over the world seeking new markets for the sale of their surplus wheat. In the last few years the Canadians have exported wheat in large quantities to the Orient, and especially to Japan, where the Canadians are rapidly appropriating the trade that in former years was largely supplied by American wheat.

In this connection may I add that in 1923 many of the wheat growers in Alberta formed a pool for the marketing of their wheat which resulted in the members receiving 8 cents more per bushel for their wheat than nonmembers of the pool.

Eighty per cent of this Alberta pool wheat was marketed outside of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, and Aaron Sapiro, the cooperative marketing expert, asserts that the Alberta pool made a blunder by marketing even 20 per cent of its wheat through the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. I mention this in passing as indicating that cooperation is a much more powerful factor in stimulating the price of wheat than legislation.

Recently Mr. J. K. R. Williams, a prominent business man in Regina, Canada, in an interview in the Manitoba Free Press, said:

The United States farmer has rendered a certain service to Canada without intending to do so. He has demanded a high protection against Canadian competition, indicating that the cost of production is lower on this (Canadian) side of the line. The present drop south of the line is in part, although not wholly, due to the enormous production of this country, but we should not allow this depression to react on us.

In other words, without a tariff the natural and normal movement of Canadian wheat is through the United States to Europe and to the Orient. But little of the Canadian wheat that enters the United States is consumed here, but the great bulk merely passes through the United States in transit to Europe or to other world markets. A tariff wall merely deprives the Canadians of their privilege of shipping their wheat into the United States to be ground into flour and then exported to Europe. With or without a tariff the ultimate destination of Canadian wheat is Europe or the other world markets, and the Canadian wheat that goes directly from Canada to the European markets competes just as much with wheat from the United States in these markets as if the Canadian wheat had passed through the United States in transit.

The Manitoba Free Press, a leading Canadian paper published at Winnipeg, in discussing the effect of the increase in the tariff duty on wheat said:

The important overnight news was the action of the President of the United States in raising the wheat duty from 30 to 42 cents per bushel.

The action of increasing the duty is not expected to affect the Canadian market to any extent but may enlarge the foreign demand, as the foreigner will naturally turn to these markets for his supplies, owing to the higher prices that will probably prevail in the United States, and the American problem will be to get rid of their surplus supplies, and the increased duty may also have a tendency to increase production, especially in the Northwestern States.

But the increase in the tariff duty did not increase the price of wheat in the United States or stimulate buying, but on the contrary immediately on the publication of the President's proclamation wheat began to decline and has declined 10 cents per bushel since the increase in the tariff was announced by the President.

Baird and Botterell, prominent grain dealers in Winnipeg, in commenting recently on the increase in the tariff duty on wheat, said:

The action of the wheat market to-day was rather a disappointment. The trade impression prevailed that the increased duty proclamation would have the effect of helping American prices and relatively to some extent in this side market, but American values practically unchanged, while Winnipeg fractionally lower.

Canadian farmers, millers, and grain men are indifferent concerning the 12-cent per bushel increase in the tariff duty on wheat. The Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922 placed an almost insurmountable barrier against the importation of wheat and flour from Canada, so that the construction of a still higher wall can do no harm to the Canadian wheat grower, miller, or dealer.

James Stewart, a well-informed Canadian grain man, in a recent interview said:

The volume of Canadian flour going into the United States since the Fordney tariff went into effect has been so insignificantly small that the going off of the market can have little effect. If the horse can not jump a 4-foot wall there is no use trying it at a 6-foot one.

John W. Horn, of the Western Canadian Flour Mills, cites a possibility of Canadian millers deriving some benefit from the added duty. He said:

Since the Fordney tariff went into effect there has been an increase in the number of inquiries for export trade, and this new duty may possibly increase this demand.

The United States can make its tariff as high as it likes—

Said N. J. Breen, of the Lake of the Woods Milling Co.—

The Fordney tariff closes that market to the Canadian millers, so the new duty can not do us any harm.

This same view is held by R. R. Dobell, of the Ogilvie Milling Co., who said:

We could not do business there since the duty was raised in 1922, so the additional tax can not do us any harm.

I quote from a prominent Winnipeg newspaper under date of March 10:

The general opinion of the Winnipeg grain trade, as expressed Saturday, was that the increase in the duty of 12 cents per bushel, or from 30 to 42 cents, would not affect the Canadian trade to any material extent, and certainly would not hurt it. American millers are forced to buy a certain amount of Canadian hard wheat for mixing purposes, and this they will take at the advance duty. The change will affect the American consumer and producer, as they will have to pay more for their flour, and exporting their surplus will be more difficult, owing to the advance in both wheat and flour, and will result in the foreign buyer turning to the Canadian markets for his supplies, which will continue on a world's price basis.

The following table will emphasize how rapidly our exports of wheat and flour are falling off:

United States exports of wheat and flour  
[Domestic production]

	Fiscal year 1922	Fiscal year 1923	Calendar year 1922	Calendar year 1923
Wheat, bushels.....	208,321,000	154,951,000	164,692,000	98,413,000
Flour, barrels.....	15,797,000	14,883,000	15,025,000	15,040,000
Wheat and flour, bushels.....	279,408,000	221,924,000	232,306,000	176,593,000

July 1, 1923, to March 1, 1924, eight months: Wheat, 63,322,000 bushels; flour, 11,117,000 barrels; total wheat and flour, in terms of wheat, 113,348,000 bushels.

Quoting from the issue of January 28, 1924, of Commerce Reports, a weekly survey of foreign trade published by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce:

The falling off—

Of wheat exports from the United States—

In recent months has been largely due to the fact that some competing countries—in particular Canada, Australia, Argentina, and India—have underbid the United States on price, when quality and grade is considered. The world takings of wheat and flour in grain-importing countries are practically up to normal and even show some increase over pre-war years. This is rather unexpected, as it was thought that the large grain crop of Europe during the past season would tend to cut down the demand from that quarter. The grain imports of Europe for the last six months of 1923 appear to be about equal to the previous year when the European crop was smaller.

In the flour trade the most significant fact is the increased exports from Pacific ports and large exportations by China. In pre-war years the United States was shipping around 1,250,000 barrels of flour to China yearly, but this rose to 2,750,000 for the year ending June 30, 1923, and for the past six months the shipments have been at the rate of 4,500,000 barrels a year. Another outstanding feature of our Far East flour trade is the fact that since the pre-war period our exports have increased by fully 100 per cent, though in some quarters—particularly in Japan—Canada has proven a strong competitor. This fact, coupled with the further fact that Japan has been expanding its home flour-milling industry, explains the decrease in our flour shipment to that country.

Proponents of a high tariff have constantly represented to the American farmer that without a tariff on wheat Canadian wheat would swamp our domestic markets. I hope at an early date to discuss this claim in detail and to demonstrate that the manufacturing interests, in order to continue an outrageously high schedule of tariff duties on their commodities, have deliberately deceived the American farmers. I will also discuss the several methods, by which wheat enters the United States from Canada and show that there was no occasion for the 12 cents per bushel increase in the tariff on wheat, and the wheat tariff was increased purely for political purposes by the present administration in a desperate, yet futile, attempt to prolong the "wheat-tariff delusion." In view of the radical decline in the market price of wheat since the duty was increased, I assume that no rational person will continue to argue that a high tariff on wheat means an increase in the market value of wheat. It is not my purpose this afternoon to discuss in detail the quantity of wheat exported from Canada to the United States in the last few years, but I will say that the quantity has been negligible as compared with the production of wheat in the United States, as the following statistics will demonstrate:

Between June, 1921, and June, 1922, only 14,555,197 bushels of wheat were imported into the United States from Canada. Of this amount, only 8,455,578 bushels were consumed in the United States, the balance having been imported for milling in bond and for immediate export to Europe or other world markets. Between July, 1922, and June, 1923, only 18,012,467 bushels of Canadian wheat were imported into the United States, of which only 7,408,150 bushels were consumed in the United States, the balance having been milled in transit and immediately thereafter exported.

Between July, 1923, and December, 1923, only 6,997,711 bushels of wheat were imported from Canada for consumption in the United States, the balance, approximately 7,000,000, were imported for milling purposes and immediately thereafter exported. Now when we consider that in 1921 the United States produced 814,905,000 bushels of wheat, 856,211,000 bushels in 1922, and 785,741,000 in 1923, it is very evident that the amount of Canadian wheat imported and consumed in the United States during that period has been trivial and so insignificant as not to influence to any degree the market price of our domestic wheats.

I have mentioned these matters to emphasize the outstanding fact that the real Canadian competition is not in the United States but in the open markets of the world, where the owners of Canadian wheat recognize conditions and make concessions in prices which enables them to sell their wheat, thereby depriving the farmers of the United States of the market which they largely dominated a few years ago.

May I also sound this note of warning? The production of wheat by Canada has not yet reached its maximum. Millions of acres of virgin lands are yet to be developed in the prairie Provinces of western Canada. The Canadian wheat lands are more productive than the wheat lands of the United States, because they have not been impoverished by long cultivation and wheat growing. The quality of Canadian wheat can not be excelled because of its large gluten content. Gluten is a combination of two proteid substances—gliadin and glutenin. The great flour-milling concerns maintain a staff of experts to analyze wheat and ascertain the proportion of gluten and also to determine what proportion of the gluten is gliadin and what part glutenin. And the value of the wheat for flour-making purposes depends upon the result of these examinations. This explains why the American millers will pay a premium on Canadian wheat because it contains a greater proportion of gluten and a larger amount of gliadin content than most American wheats. Wheat produced on new lands invariably contains a larger amount of gluten and of gliadin content. These technical matters are factors in the wheat equation which materially influence the price millers are willing to pay for wheat.

So our surplus American wheat meets the surplus Canadian wheat in the great world markets. Each competes with the other and with wheat from other nations. The Canadian wheat is grown on cheap fertile lands. The American wheat is largely grown on lands that have been impoverished by excessive cultivation, but which lands are nevertheless "high priced" as compared with the Canadian land. It costs less to produce the Canadian wheat. It can be sold at a lower price than American wheat and yet the Canadian farmer will fare as well as the Yankee neighbor.

I have studied the Canadian wheat problem long and thoughtfully. I have accumulated a wealth of statistics in relation to the production and marketing of Canadian wheat as well as the production and the marketing of wheat from all other wheat-growing regions. I have tried to analyze the situation with a view of suggesting some method by which our domestic wheat growers may meet this and other competition in the world market and receive for their commodities, not only the cost of production but a fair profit in addition. I confess that the problem is a serious and complicated one. Permanent relief, in my opinion, will not come until there is a radical reconstruction of our economic system, but I believe that some worth-while temporary relief can be obtained by the enactment of some legislation now pending in this Congress. Until this legislation has been definitely formulated and reported to the House for consideration it would serve no useful purpose for me or anyone else to discuss it, because we do not know in what form this legislation will be presented. But I desire to state that in this national emergency I shall feel justified in supporting every measure which promises substantial relief for the agricultural classes. The national welfare demands that agriculture must be restored quickly and permanently to the class of profitable occupations. The American farmer must not be reduced to a condition of economic servitude. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

[Mr. LOZIER was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER].

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take any time on the bill because anyone who examines the bill and reads the hearings soon realizes that there is no controverted matter. I want only to take a moment in fairness and justice to the committee because some have taken the floor in opposition to the bill and made representations that will be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which will look ridiculous unless answered.

The bill is to give men that the Secretary of Agriculture has in foreign countries the same status, the same official standing, that the other department heads give their men in foreign countries. That is necessary because agriculture is a basic industry of this Nation, and because we must, as the gentleman just stated, pay some attention to our exportable surplus food products.

The bugaboo about increasing the expenditures of the Government I want to say is imaginary. It is the unanimous judgment of the Committee on Agriculture that it will not have a tendency to increase the expenditures a dime. That is foreign to the issue. The only issue is whether the men over there now should have this status. I can understand how a man that gets inflamed when he reads the word "attaché" in a bill and thinks that the postmasters of the United States are under the civil service—how it would be practically impossible for him to understand a bill even after having read and studied it. He says the postmasters are under the civil service, which, of course, is not true. He says, for that reason, if these men go under the civil service they will be appointed from a partisan standpoint. Every Member of Congress, except the gentleman himself, knows the facts about that. There is not a Member of Congress who knows the politics of the men in the department. As a matter of fact, they care very little about the politics of these men. What we want to know is about their efficiency. I do not believe there is a man here who has been called upon for a recommendation for any man who has gone into the Department of Agriculture under the civil service since—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I heard former Secretary Wilson, of the Department of Agriculture, say that he had 9,000 employees and he did not know the politics of 9 of them. Later I heard Secretary Houston say, when told what Secretary Wilson said, "That beats me. I know the politics in the Department of Agriculture only of myself and my private secretary."

Mr. TINCHER. Is there any Member of Congress that was ever called upon or ever did recommend a man for a civil-service position in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. RUBEY. I agree with the gentleman about politics in the Department of Agriculture. Will the gentleman say that he does not know the politics of the postmasters appointed in his district?

Mr. TINCHER. Postmasters are not under civil service. That is the thing that I was criticizing the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD] for. The President issued a proclamation by which he is using the Civil Service Department for the purpose of conducting certain examinations to obtain an eligible list, but no one has ever dreamed that the postmasters are under the civil service.

Mr. RUBEY. Under the administration preceding this the man who got the highest grade, regardless of politics, was appointed. Under the present plan one of the three highest is selected, and he is always selected according to his politics.

Mr. TINCHER. I represent a good big congressional district. We have lots of postmasters in it. Under the Wilson administration every one of them was a Democrat, without a single exception. Under the Harding administration and the Coolidge administration they have all come to be Republicans, except two or three. [Laughter.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. UPSHAW. In all good humor I think the gentleman from Kansas will have to revise that statement that the postmasters are not under the civil service. I suppose he means certain great ones here and there.

Mr. TINCHER. Oh, I do not yield further, because the gentleman has manifested a lack of information on the subject that I am discussing to such an extent that I do not want to have him use any more of my time.

Mr. UPSHAW. In thorough good humor I deny the allegation and I defy the allegator.

Mr. TINCHER. There is a way that we can put the postmasters under the civil service if we want to. This law will put these attachés under the civil service, and I claim that there is not a Member of Congress who will say that politics has anything to do with the civil service, and no man in the Civil Service Department has ever been affected by politics. If the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD] has not any better opportunity for position after the next election than to be appointed to a civil-service place by reason of his being a Democrat, then he would better run again for Congress or take some other long shot, because he will not get it in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW].

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my purpose in taking time to-day is not only to say a good word for this bill but also to refer to certain other proposed legislation which we hope will soon come before the House. We have been working in committees, several committees, for some weeks and months in the interest of three bills which might very properly be considered together, if it were possible so to do. I refer to a Rogers bill, so called, which affects the operations of the State Department and the personnel of it. I refer to this bill, the contents of which you know. I refer also to another bill which affects the interest of the Commerce Department in respect of its foreign bureau in pretty much the same way and pretty generally along the same lines as this Agriculture Committee bill affects the Department of Agriculture. All three of these bills are worthy of consideration, support, and passage. They provide for three distinct arms of the foreign service of this country, which under proper regulation should work together and form as much of a unit as the palm of the hand and the fingers upon it. They ought to be operated, and can be, in the interest primarily of the United States without regard to what department they come from. In the next place, they ought to be, and can be and I believe will be, operated in behalf of the particular function of government as to the department which each provides.

We have a foreign field, and we have been going forward in that foreign field in the last few years to an extent and degree hitherto unknown in the United States. Competing foreign countries have known the lesson of seeking trade in foreign lands for a long time, and we have done practically nothing as to taking trade until within the last 10 years. Preceding that we had some here, some there. We were spasmodic. We did not have sense enough to manufacture our wares with particular reference to the demand of the foreign buyer, but we would insist on making what we thought was best, ship it, and then have it sent home again, and altogether we made a fine mess of it. That led sooner or later to the development of further and more careful consideration of the foreign field.

For many years the State Department has had its staff divided, speaking generally, in two parts, the essentially diplomatic division and the consular division. The diplomatic rather runs out of our line of vision at the moment and ought not to be brought into this picture, but when it comes to the consular division we come immediately to a branch which is of great importance in the field of commerce in foreign countries. We should consider it. The Consular Service has done a good work for many years, and I think we have depended upon it until comparatively recently for about all the inspiration and all of the results which we have had in connection with foreign business, but since commerce has developed as it has we have found the representatives of this country in the Consular Service unfitted by the character of their attainments and by virtue of stress of other duties which they had to perform, for the function of directing extended attention specifically in the line of trade developments, and so we have had grow up foreign trade matters automatically in two other departments. The Agricultural Department has carried on their work according to their own lights, and later on and for the last 10 years the Department of Commerce has carried along their foreign work in a very much bigger, broader, and more comprehensive way than ever before. The result of it is that we are now in a place where we are either

to go into the foreign trade of the world and go after it systematically, regularly, in an intelligent way, with a view of getting it, or we may as well shut it all off. The elements which enter into the foreign trade are many. All departments of the Government affecting trade have now come to realize that there is a foreign interest for each, and we have all lines of trade—textiles, minerals, all products of the soil, lumber, machinery, anything and everything that you can think of—being considered with a view to foreign consumption.

I come specifically to this bill. I have had occasion, it has been my duty to have occasion, to study this foreign field work of all departments carefully for the last four months, and I have been led to study it more carefully by virtue of the fact that some people, who apparently had not studied it as carefully, were led to believe that certain influences of the Government and of Congress and of committees were directly against this agricultural bill. That has never been so. The contrast was drawn between what is known as the Winslow bill, emanating from the Committee on Interstate Commerce in behalf of the Department of Commerce, on the one hand, and this bill on the other. Some overenthusiastic agriculturists, and I am speaking in a friendly way, seem to think because commerce needed something and was going for it that they were necessarily opponents of Agricultural Department progress. That is not so. Those of us who have been proponents of the development of the foreign bureau of the Commerce Department are as much interested in the development of agricultural interests in any and all of the channels where it can be possibly developed as we are in the development of the Commerce Department end. But we have a bill—the Rogers bill—for the State Department, the Haugen bill for the Agricultural Department, and the Winslow bill for the Commerce Department. There is nothing in this bill, in my judgment, which would interfere or need to interfere with the bureau representatives in other directions. I do not agree at all with my young friend from Texas with regard to the sole purposes for which men go into the Consular Service of our foreign service. I do think, however, that the time has been when the personal adornment, the manner of dress, the delivery of the card, played an all too important part in an effort to pass the time away. Now has come a condition of affairs wherein the consular office is overloaded and run over by foreign business possibilities. Is the country going to say we will be cheap and parsimonious while clamoring for foreign business, and shall we continue to resolve in our political platforms for foreign business, yet not put out a dollar in an effort to get back \$1.10? Business is not done that way. You must have the courage—

Mr. BLANTON rose.

Mr. WINSLOW. Nothing doing.

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. WINSLOW. Go ahead.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. WINSLOW. I will take that at the end. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the yielding, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WINSLOW. Now, if we are to follow the ordinary trend of business, which means we must put out something before we take it back at a profit, we must allow our Government, which is the only central organization which ever can develop foreign trade possibilities, and so forth, to put out its dollar. It is not a question of whether or not we put out a dollar that need be concerned. It is a question of what use we make of our dollar when the dollar is put out. If we can put out the dollar advantageously, let us put it out, and the more the better. There appeared before our committee in respect of agricultural features, which is absolutely essentially necessary for the development of commerce and control of it, representatives of the farm interests, marketing, for instance, of rice and raisins, I believe, cotton, tobacco, the largest distributing organizations representing our productive element in this country, and in every instance they contributed very valuable testimony to the good they had received from the operations of our foreign departments. Now here is a bill to strengthen our arm. We want this bill, and we want the others, one working along one line, one working along another line, and for my part I am not looking for votes from an agricultural district at all, I am looking for the good will of the people who make fabrics, who make machinery, textiles, boots and shoes, and a lot of things. We want to sell them in foreign countries. We want to know all the economic and other phases of the foreign business which will in any way affect the well-being of our interests there. But we know this: With closest regard for the institutions of the United States it is not enough for us to ask to have a Department of Com-

merce or of Agriculture, or anything else, set up with reference to and solely for its own interests.

We must have a department set up for the interest of everybody in this country and get the benefit of it wherever and however we can. So for this reason, and with the explanation of the fact that this bill ought to be regarded as a good bill on its own, but a better bill if it may be combined with two other bills which will go through, or ought to go through, in order to make this one the great success that it ought to be, I hope everybody will support it, and I will register the hope also that when the other two bills come before the House attention will be paid to each. A nonpartisan and broad American view should be the only view of the membership of the House. Each will help build up and make solid and more complete the bureau or bureaus for foreign trade through which we hope to be able to take a big share for our people. [Applause.]

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman give way?

Mr. WINSLOW. I will.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. May I ask the gentleman if in his judgment the appointment by this country of attachés in foreign fields at our legations have already justified their existence from the practical results they have received in increasing our foreign commerce?

Mr. WINSLOW. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I came into the room for a twofold purpose, or perhaps with the choice of two purposes. The first was to indorse this bill on its merits. The second was to indulge in a scrapping match, if any need arose, with those persons who have been credited with an intention to fight violently against the commerce department development on certain lines. This is a magazine full of dynamite and all sorts of statistical ammunition.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I do not care to press the question.

Mr. WINSLOW. I would like to have it pressed, of course, but this is not my day; it is not my inning. I will give you just a little suggestion. One department of the Government—and it shall be nameless, unless I am forced to reveal it by somebody else—had from July 2, 1922, to July 30, 1923, 881,521 direct communications from the public of the United States in reference to foreign trade. This year, on an estimate based on seven and one-half months, it will go to 1,100,000. That is giving a fair suggestion of the development of foreign trade interest and the work which is being done in that line by departments of this Government. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. You mean by that that is an indication of the increasing interest of our people and our commercial interests in foreign trade, and the fact that they consider this is an excellent agency from which to get necessary information to deal with foreign trade?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes. And that is only one department. I need not mention others.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. One other question. Does not the gentleman think it is necessary to have these additional agricultural attachés? And then why it is not possible, if this is a matter of foreign commerce, for the Department of Commerce, through its own system of commercial attachés, to cover the extension of trade in our agricultural products as well as the other commodities that go into commerce?

Mr. WINSLOW. Owing to a lack of time I hesitate to go into it, but here is the answer in general: The Commerce Department is not particularly called upon to do a great deal, except on special occasions now and then, with what you might call the scientific consideration of agricultural matters. It has to do more with what we call the trade considerations.

Mr. WEALED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. WINSLOW. I want to answer this one first. The Agriculture Department not only has a field of usefulness in connection with trade, but by virtue of the fact that they have a lot of men who are especially trained for the consideration of agricultural matters, as the Department of Commerce has men especially trained for the consideration of the general trade matters, there are many lines of endeavor for purposes of report which they can fulfill which the commercial men could not perhaps do as well, because they do not have in the Department of Commerce men especially trained on agricultural subjects. That is, the agriculturally trained men can do a lot on the trade in general and help a lot, and so the commerce man can carry on his regular duties and, although untrained, can do a lot to help out the agricultural interests as bearing on commercial considerations.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I was interested in the gentleman's statement to the effect that the diplomatic branch of our operations belongs to the State Department. Has the gentleman observed this paragraph in section 3 on page 2—

The Department of State shall accredit, in the same manner as the secretary of an embassy or legation of the United States, as agricultural attachés of diplomatic standing to such countries as the Secretary of Agriculture shall deem advisable, the agricultural commissioners at present representing the Department of Agriculture in foreign countries and such other agricultural attachés as shall be appointed from time to time by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Does not that bring these attachés into different relation with the foreign countries than those of any other department? That is, diplomats are accredited and attachés are certified and consuls are notified.

Mr. WINSLOW. There is to be an amendment put in there which will bring that in accord with the proposed plan of the Commerce Department in their proposed development with the Agriculture Department—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes. I want to ask him a few questions.

Mr. WINSLOW. I will give the time to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who is one of the very successful business men of the United States, and I will say that I am a great admirer of him, notwithstanding that fact. [Laughter.] There might be some of my colleagues who would be afraid to say that they are admirers of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, but I am not afraid to say that.

Mr. WINSLOW. Everybody likes pleasant words, and I am not an exception.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman if he owes his success in business to any commercial attachés in Europe? Did not his success come in consequence of—

Mr. WINSLOW. One question at a time, please. You ask and I answer. I am going to tell you no, and then I am going on, because when I handled the work that I have referred to there was no Commerce Department organized to do it, and I had trouble with the consular department because they were not properly organized to do it. That is one of the reasons why I am now favoring the development of the Commerce Department and the Agricultural Department.

Mr. BLANTON. But notwithstanding the fact that we did not have those commercial and agricultural attachés, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, with extraordinary American ingenuity, overcame all obstacles and made a success in his business?

Mr. WINSLOW. Granting that, rather than arguing it, I did it with great effort and at great expense as contrasted with prompt service now furnished by our Commerce Department.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. WINSLOW. Go ahead.

Mr. BLANTON. In view of the fact that the Agricultural Committee sent for the gentleman to come here to answer the gentleman from Texas—

Mr. WINSLOW. No; I came of my own volition.

Mr. BLANTON. I understood that the gentleman came here with that primary purpose in mind.

Mr. WINSLOW. No. I was watching them, but they have not behaved as I thought they might.

Mr. BLANTON. Physically, I will not cross swords with the former distinguished athlete from Harvard; I will only cross swords with him on the floor in a parliamentary way. I want to say this: The bill which the gentleman indorses provides not only that our present representatives shall be accredited by the State Department as agricultural attachés, but it provides that they shall also accredit such other agricultural attachés as shall be appointed.

Mr. WINSLOW. Why not?

Mr. BLANTON. How many are going to be appointed?

Mr. WINSLOW. I do not know.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not think the gentleman did know.

Mr. WINSLOW. I hope the gentleman will let me answer. I trust they will appoint just one more than they really have all-day use for, so as to be a little bit ahead of the game. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Applause from the committee—a sporting committee. Let me ask the gentleman another question. This bill provides, out of the ordinary, that the subsistence allowance of these men shall be fixed not by Congress but shall be fixed

by the Secretary of Agriculture. Does the gentleman know how much of a subsistence allowance he is going to allow?

Mr. WINSLOW. No; but they have to eat.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; but he could allow \$5 or \$10 or \$20 or \$30 or \$50.

Mr. WINSLOW. They would live well on \$20 a day; they would get by on \$10, and probably go hungry on \$5.

Mr. BLANTON. But if they had to assume extra social obligations over there by reason of this accrediting business, they could probably use \$25 or \$30 or \$50, could they not?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes; but it is not provided for in this bill. Of course, we do not care what they do of their own accord.

Mr. BLANTON. But this is a legislative bill?

Mr. WINSLOW. It is.

Mr. BLANTON. If we provided for it by law, then the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], in the Appropriations Committee room yonder, will bring in the money necessary as a natural sequence to the legislation.

Mr. WINSLOW. Has the gentleman an agreement to that effect with Mr. MADDEN?

Mr. BLANTON. I know he does his duty under the law.

Mr. WINSLOW. I think so, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment.

Mr. KING. I am going to make a suggestion.

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I have got to answer the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] first, who said that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD] displayed ignorance when he made the statement that postmasters are under the civil service. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] said that none of them were under civil service, and he likewise accused my friend from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW] of ignorance because he said postmasters were under civil service, and the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] said there were none under civil service. Usually when he shakes those woolly locks of his and says something it is hard to dispute him, but I am going to dispute him now. What about fourth-class postmasters? Are they not under civil service?

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. But they do not furnish a list of them like the gentleman was talking about.

Mr. BLANTON. But they are postmasters and they are under civil service, and the gentleman said there was none under civil service.

Mr. TINCHER. I never said that.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I will leave it to the gentleman from Georgia if the gentleman from Kansas did not say that. Did he say that?

Mr. UPSHAW. I so understood him.

Mr. BLANTON. And others so understood him. We tried to check him and correct him, but he would not let us; he would not yield for correction. But let me tell him something else. He said that during the Wilson administration there were no Republican postmasters in office. I want to say to my friend from Kansas that in my old home town of Albany, Tex., where I was married and where I raised my family, the splendid postmaster there during eight years of the Wilson administration was a Republican and was indorsed by all local Democrats.

Mr. WEFALD. How could he live in Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to state that one of the best postmasters in another city in my district was a Republican during that administration and Mr. Wilson knew it, and I want to say that I indorsed those two men in spite of the fact that they were Republicans, because they were good men. And yet the gentleman from Kansas talks about partisan politics and appointments under the Wilson administration.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Both of those postmasters, however, were Blanton Republicans, were they not?

Mr. BLANTON. If they had not been, they would not have been such good men. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMSON. They would not have been good Republicans.

Mr. BLANTON. The good men of my district are backing BLANTON here and have always backed him, Republicans and Democrats alike.

Mr. STENGLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. STENGLE. I just want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the postmaster of Boston, Mass., is a Republican taken from the civil-service list by order of President Wilson.

Mr. BLANTON. Why, of course. Whenever President Wilson found a good man needed for a certain place his politics did not make much difference—once in a while.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am enough of a partisan Democrat, however, that if there were two men, both of required qualifications and both good men, I would want the Democrat appointed instead of the Republican and would insist on it, and so would you Republicans vice versa.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Would he have to be just as good?

Mr. BLANTON. Almost as good; but let me say in conclusion, because I have taken up too much time already—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield myself three more minutes.

Let me say that the reason we can not reduce expenses is because we do not make the start. Every time a committee comes in here with a bill it is going to steam roller any man who gets up against it. If they have not the men on their committee qualified to answer a man, they will send out and get the big chairman of the big Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to come in and sandbag him. [Laughter.] That is the reason you can not stop such measures. The committee will not let you stop them, but I want to tell you right now that you had better train up some more men in your Harvard athletic association, because I am going to oppose these committees here, and you are going to have to send out and get some more of them, because I have downed the gentleman from Massachusetts, with all his athletic experience, on the facts of this bill.

The gentleman said he indorsed it and he does not know anything about it. I showed him that he did not know how many attachés could be appointed under this bill. He does not know now. I showed him that he did not know how much subsistence allowance was provided for.

Mr. WINSLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. WINSLOW. Do you know?

Mr. BLANTON. I know this—

Mr. WINSLOW. Do you know how many?

Mr. BLANTON. I know it is unlimited.

Mr. WINSLOW. Do you know how many?

Mr. BLANTON. I know that no man knows.

Mr. WINSLOW. Do you know how many?

Mr. BLANTON. No.

Mr. WINSLOW. Neither do I.

Mr. BLANTON. And no man knows. That is what I am getting at. It is my business to know and it is your business to know before we pass legislation. Your very question is an argument against this bill. It shows that none of us knows, and none of us knows how much subsistence allowance they are going to give these agricultural attachés abroad, and we ought to know before we pass this bill. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, or whatever time I have left.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Five minutes, and then I am through.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I think I can prove by my good friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] that I have never taken an active part in partisan debate. I have, somehow or other, preferred to leave that to the great party bellwethers on either side; but I am unwilling for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which our critics declare is "brilliant only in the flames," to carry the statement or the indictment, first, that the gentleman from Georgia did not know anything about postmasters under the civil service, and, further, for it to carry what I count the very erroneous statement that "postmasters are not under civil service, and everybody in Congress knows it." I think that was about the statement.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UPSHAW. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASWELL. Is it not possible that the gentleman misunderstood the gentleman from Kansas? The gentleman means that the present administration is paying no attention to the civil service.

Mr. UPSHAW. My experience prepares me to accept the gentleman's interpretation.

I rejoice to vote "dry" with the gentleman from Kansas and vote with him also and always for the farmer, but on this question of history and administration procedure we will have to part company just a little.

These facts of civil-service abuse are widely known. I have this incident in my district: In one town in my district a civil-service examination for postmaster was called. It was announced as a civil-service examination and held under civil-service auspices. There were only two eligibles reported to my office and both of them were Democrats. A Republican stood the examination but could not make the grade. No. 1 of the eligibles declined to accept the position and resigned in favor of No. 2. No. 2 was the assistant postmaster for eight years, wonderfully popular, and I presented with my own hands at the Post Office Department here a petition signed by every business man in that town, except the firm with which the Republican was connected.

They refused to appoint this man who had served the district eight years so acceptably wholly and only because he was a Democrat, and called a new examination, and then immediately appointed as acting postmaster the very man who had failed to make the grade, and he has been serving in that capacity now for two years over the widespread opposition of those who overwhelmingly indorsed the other man. That is one illustration of my contention that the so-called civil service connection which is supposed to be nonpartisan is an absolute travesty on the name.

Mr. LOWREY. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. UPSHAW. Certainly.

Mr. LOWREY. I had an exactly similar case in my district. The man whose rating was way down about 50 was appointed acting postmaster and is there yet, and the man who made the highest grade, nearly 90, was an ex-service man who had been in the service two years, serving about 18 months abroad.

Mr. UPSHAW. Good; I am going to duplicate that incident. In another office in my district a splendid young man, who was wounded at Chateau-Thierry, whose brother was shot down at his side, was appointed postmaster, being the only eligible, four years ago. When his time expired or was about to expire they called an examination.

This man, hero of the most pivotal battle, perhaps, in the World War—yes, and the hero of his home community life—backed by a petition of something like 3,000 in the county, made first grade; and yet the third one on the eligible list was appointed over him for the sole reason that this popular postmaster was a Democrat. Now, this is my point—and I am not saying this politically. I do not blame—nobody blames the Republican at either place for accepting the position after securing the indorsement of the Republican chairman; but I want to join hands with the gentleman from Kansas and introduce a bill, if he will, that will make a civil-service examination absolutely final and that will keep Congressmen and Senators of both parties away from the Post Office Department to influence an appointment. Let the first one on the list be appointed, purely on the basis of proven merit, if we are going to call it civil service. If not, wipe out this travesty on the name of "civil service."

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPSHAW. I will gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TINCHER. The fourth-class postmasters by law are under the civil service; but has the gentleman ever heard any complaint regarding either party about them outside of fourth-class postmasters?

Mr. UPSHAW. The gentleman does not deny, of course, that it is true of third-class postmasters, second and even first, that it is announced there is going to be an examination and that the civil service announces that examination?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. UPSHAW. The very spirit of the civil service is to remove partisan politics. In all good humor I issue a challenge to the gentleman from Kansas now to join me in preparing and presenting a bill making civil-service ratings mandatory and keeping Congressmen and Senators from trying to interfere with the grade that has been made by qualified applicants.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPSHAW. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. Does not the gentleman know that in civil-service appointments all along the line three men are selected, and of those the one most desirable gets the postmastership, as along other lines of the civil service?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. UPSHAW. I will say to my good friend from Colorado that that is the very point of which I complain. If we leave any leeway, the Democrats and Republicans both are going down there and wink at the authorities in favor of their man.

If we put in the man or the woman who wins the crown of merit and keep political influence away from both sides, the civil service will no longer be a political travesty but will be a redemption of its very name and its original spirit. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I came in the House at a very interesting point in this discussion and that was with reference to the civil service as applied to the postal appointments. I was very greatly heartened and strengthened when I heard that part of the President's message last December in which he advocated an extension of the civil service. On that occasion he said:

The maintenance and extension of the classified civil service is exceedingly important. There are nearly 550,000 persons in the executive civil service drawing about \$700,000,000 of yearly compensation. Four-fifths of these are in the classified service. This method of selection of the employees of the United States is especially desirable for the Post Office Department. The Civil Service Commission has recommended that postmasters at first, second, and third class offices be classified. Such action, accompanied by a repeal of the four-year term of office, would undoubtedly be an improvement. I also recommend that the field force for prohibition enforcement be brought within the classified civil service without covering in the present membership. The best method for selecting public servants is the merit system.

This language would lead the people of the country to believe that the President was earnestly in favor of the civil service, and of course expected the present civil service law as applied to postal employees to be sympathetically administered.

I want to emphasize what has already been said, and that is that the civil service law as administered through the Post Office Department at present is a farce.

Now, what are the facts? What is true in my district, the second district of Oklahoma, is true throughout the Nation. They advertise and hold civil-service examinations, and a list of eligibles is certified, and the department is supposed to select one from the list of three, the highest on the eligible list. Preference is supposed to be given to the ex-service men. That has been entirely disregarded.

Unless the name of a partisan Republican is found on the list of eligibles some excuse is made and another examination is held. There has not been a single Democrat appointed to a post office of any consequence in the second congressional district of Oklahoma during the present administration. This is also true as to the appointment of rural carriers. A list of eligibles is sent out by the Post Office Department containing the names of those certified by the Civil Service Commission, and attention is invited to section 10 of the civil service act, and to civil service rule 1, section 3, on the following form:

Hon. W. W. HASTINGS,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. HASTINGS: The department is considering the appointment of a postmaster at \_\_\_\_\_, an office of the fourth class, from the following list of eligibles:

Information from any source regarding the character or residence of eligibles will be considered, but because of the statute and civil-service rule (this being an appointment in the classified service) the department is not permitted to consider or file recommendations of a political or religious nature.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. BARTLETT,

First Assistant Postmaster General,

(Civil service act, sec. 10)

That no recommendation of any person who shall apply for office or place under the provisions of this act which may be given by any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, except as to the character or residence of the applicant, shall be received or considered by any person concerned in making any examination or appointment under this act.

(Civil service rule 1, sec. 3)

No recommendation of an applicant, eligible, or employee in the competitive service involving a disclosure of his political or religious opinions or affiliations shall be considered or filed by the commission or by any officer concerned in making appointments or promotions.

Everyone knows that the politics of every applicant is communicated to the department before an appointment is made. No one on the floor will deny this, and surely the department will itself not deny it.

There may have been a few fourth-class postmasters appointed who live at remote places in the country where the compensation is practically nothing and where no one else could be found to accept the office.

The country should know that the present administration has no regard whatever for the civil service. My constituents, having read the President's message to Congress and believing him to be sincerely desirous of extending the civil service law, continue to write me with reference to appointments in the Postal Service, and I want to bring to their attention in this public way the fact that the civil service is entirely ignored as applied to post-office appointments. No appointment is made until the politics of the applicant is known to the appointive powers. Neither is the preference given to ex-service men. Partisans are given the preference over those who fought for the flag. You ask me what is done in the event all on the eligible list are Democrats? That reminds me of a story told on a passenger conductor on a western train at an early date. He said that he flipped the coin paid him by the passenger, and if it did not lodge on the bell cord it was his, and if it did he flipped it again. If the list does not contain the names of partisans recommended by the county committee, a new list is called for. The country, therefore, should not be deceived by the statement of the President about civil service. Every Member of the House understands it. The country, including the ex-service men, will finally come to know the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HERSEY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HERSEY. A little while ago I went out, and at that time we were considering the agricultural bill. I would like to know what became of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, I consider H. R. 7111 as a very important measure in favor of the farmers of the land.

Under its provisions the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire and disseminate information which, among other things, will enable the farmers to better meet world conditions and inform them of the demand for farm products in foreign countries.

In order to do this the Secretary is authorized to appoint persons qualified to acquire this information, and they will become a part of our embassies and will go with the persons sent to represent our country in foreign lands. This will give them official standing. It is also provided that the Civil Service Commission shall determine the competency of these agents.

Of course, much of their usefulness to the farmers will depend upon the selection and appointment of men who are well qualified along these lines and who fully realize the importance of foreign markets for the farmers.

The majority of our people live upon the farm. Farming is our basic industry. When the farmer prospers all other industries prosper. They largely produce their own living and the food for those engaged in other industries. They produce more than can be consumed in this country, and the surplus must be disposed of in the markets of the world. In that market they must compete with the labor of other countries. There can be no tariffs levied to control those markets or the level of prices therein. They are compelled to accept the world price, less the cost of transportation and handling.

There has been quite a revolution of thought on the question of the importance of foreign markets for agricultural products in recent years.

Only a few years ago we were told that all that the American farmer needed was the home market; that it would be sufficient to make him prosperous.

We were also told that we should have nothing to do with other countries, and that we were not interested in them. Sober second thought, due largely to the changed conditions of the farmers, has convinced most people that the doctrine of isolation, or having nothing to do with other nations, is not a good policy for the farmers.

Commercially we can not entirely separate ourselves from other countries, but are interested in and affected by their conditions and their ability to purchase of us that which they need and can not produce themselves.

The farmer can not leave his farm to hunt for markets in foreign countries for his surplus. If he can not sell it, it reduces the price of the part he does sell in the domestic market. The Government must aid him in finding markets. Legislation for that purpose must be enacted as soon as possible.

It expended last year over \$69,000,000 to teach him how to produce crops, and is it not about time that it should spend some money to find a place where he can sell them? It will be a waste of public money to keep on expending it to encourage production if he has no market for his surplus after it is produced.

This bill will not entirely relieve the present distress of the farmers of the land, but it is a step in the right direction. Other comprehensive legislation will be required to relieve his present condition and prevent its recurrence, but this will help. It will enable the Secretary of Agriculture to have agents in every country who will keep in touch with the conditions in each and report to him the demands that may exist for our agricultural products therein. He can then communicate this information to the farmers' cooperative associations and other selling agencies in this country. I go upon the theory that it is rare that too much will be produced if that which is produced can reach the mouths of the men, women, and children of the world who are hungry.

The present deplorable condition of the farmers has aroused a new interest in the need of foreign markets, and it is rather strange that more vigorous steps to secure them have been so long delayed. This condition has emphasized the importance of keeping this need in mind in shaping remedial legislation. The farmer must have more than the home market.

When the present depression began to appear the Secretary of Agriculture in report to the President in 1921 said:

Had some way been found for the people in need to buy our surplus at prices which would cover the cost of production, the American farmer would have been prosperous and the country would have prospered with him. It is a terrible indictment of modern civilization that with such abundance here there are millions of people overseas suffering for the bare necessities, and other millions starving to death, and surely we are sadly lacking in our understanding of economic laws or in the adjustment to them when the production of bounteous crops grown by the hard labor of 13,000,000 farmers and farm workers and their families is permitted to play such large part in paralyzing our industries and business at home, for that is what has happened. The purchasing power of the principal farm crops of the year 1921 at the present time is lower than ever before known.

The purchasing power of our major grain crops is little more than half what it was on an average for the five pre-war years 1910-1914, inclusive.

When we remember that approximately 40 per cent of all our people live in the open country and are dependent upon what grows out of the soil, the baneful effect upon the Nation of reducing the purchasing power of that 40 per cent so far below normal is obvious.

Then the Secretary adds:

The farmer is compelled to practice the most rigid economy, to wear his old clothes, to repair his own machinery, to refrain from purchasing everything he can possibly do without, and to deny himself and his family not alone luxuries but many of the ordinary comforts of life.

This statement is a complete answer to the policy of isolation. The conditions which the Secretary describes, instead of becoming better have grown worse and will continue to grow worse as long as present conditions remain unchanged. True, the farmer has lost millions in the purchasing power of his products, but that is not all.

In addition to that he has lost over one-third of his capital in the fall of the price of his land. Many have lost their farms and many others are facing bankruptcy.

This statement of the Secretary was made just before the opening of the regular session of Congress in 1921. What was done by it or any subsequent Congress to afford relief from the conditions which he so clearly describes?

It will be noticed that the Secretary says in substance, "If some way had been found to sell our own surplus abroad, the farmer would have been prosperous."

It is incumbent on those who have had control of Congress and of our foreign policy since that utterance to explain why they have not found that way.

It seems to me that the highest duty of this Congress is to take up the whole question and see whether or not that way can be found. I am in favor of remaining here until every possible form of legislation for the relief of the farmer can be enacted.

If we do not, his distress will spread and soon reach the other industries of the land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate is exhausted, and the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized:

(1) To acquire and disseminate information which will enable American farmers to adjust their operations and practices better to meet world conditions, especially information concerning international agricultural economics, farm management, and agricultural product marketing practices employed in foreign countries, and the past, present, and prospective production of and demand for agricultural products in foreign countries, including animals and animal products, dairy products, cereals, fibers, fruits, vegetables, nuts, and other farm and forest products.

(2) To cooperate with producers, farm organizations and associations, and others, both individually and collectively, in demonstrating standards for agricultural products, and by all such other methods of facilitating the handling of and extending and strengthening the demand for agricultural products as require special agricultural skill and knowledge.

(3) The Department of State shall accredit, in the same manner as a secretary of an embassy or legation of the United States, as agricultural attachés with diplomatic standing to such countries as the Secretary of Agriculture shall deem advisable the agricultural commissioners at present representing the Department of Agriculture in foreign countries and such other agricultural attachés as shall be appointed from time to time by the Secretary of Agriculture after an examination to be held at his direction and in accordance with the regulations of the Civil Service Commission to determine their competency.

(4) The Secretary of Agriculture may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and may cooperate with any department or agency of any government, any State, Territory, District, or possession, or department, agency, or political subdivision thereof, or any person, and shall have the power to appoint, remove, and fix and pay the compensation of such officers and employees, not in conflict with existing law, and make such expenditures for rent outside the District of Columbia, printing, telegrams, telephones, law books, books of reference, maps, periodicals, furniture, stationery, office equipment, travel and subsistence allowances, and other supplies and expenses as shall be necessary to the administration of the act in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and as may be appropriated for by Congress.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the word "which" and insert in lieu thereof "through agricultural extension agencies and by such other means as."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 6, strike out lines 6 to 23, inclusive, and insert:

"To cooperate with American producers, farm organizations, associations, departments of the Government, and others, both individually and collectively, by all such methods as require special agricultural skill and knowledge in facilitating the handling of and extending and strengthening the demand for agricultural products abroad and in demonstrating standards of cotton, wheat, and other American agricultural products in foreign countries.

"The agricultural commissioners at present representing the Department of Agriculture in foreign countries shall hereafter be known as agricultural attachés, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to appoint from time to time other agricultural attachés after an examination to be held under his direction and in accordance with the regulations of the Civil Service Commission to determine their competency.

"Such officers when designated for assignment to foreign posts by the Secretary of Agriculture shall, through the Department of State, be regularly and officially attached to the diplomatic missions of the United States in the countries in which they are to be stationed, and when such officers are assigned to countries in which there is no diplomatic mission of the United States appropriate recognition and standing with full facilities for discharging their official duties shall be arranged by the Department of State: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State may reject the name of any such officer whose assignment to the foreign post for which he has been designated would, in his judgment, be prejudicial to the public policy of the United States."

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I understood the Committee on Agriculture and the Department of State have had some correspondence concerning subsection 3. Do I understand the language proposed is in accordance with the desire

and suggestion of the Department of State and the Secretary of State?

Mr. KETCHAM. I will say in response to the gentleman that I have here a letter submitting or suggesting the form of the amendment and the reply of the Secretary of State, which I will read if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to have the gentleman read it.

Mr. KETCHAM (reading)—

The language of the proposed substitute appears to meet all requirements and to provide in the correct way for establishing these officers with appropriate standing as a part of the diplomatic mission.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The proposed substitute is in the language suggested?

Mr. KETCHAM. Identically.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is not easy to get the exact meaning and effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. I have no doubt it has been carefully prepared and considered by the committee and am not saying it is not right. But I notice the reference to the Civil Service Commission, which indicates that appointments are to be made as the result of civil-service examinations. I am not criticizing the commission nor its examinations, but I have some information as to how our commercial attachés and trade commissioners representing the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce are selected and appointed. If I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, the plan it would prescribe would not be as effective in securing the right kind of officials as is the plan long pursued by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. In that bureau a board is selected by the Secretary, I believe, from among the officials of the bureau. That board is not always the same, its make-up depending upon the character of the work to be done by those who are to be appointed and the country into which they will go if employed. That board requires two examinations, oral and written. A written examination is first held by or under the direction of the Civil Service Commission, which certifies the names of the more competent candidates to the board. The board then conducts an oral examination of applicants whose names have been certified to it by the commission. My understanding is very satisfactory results are reached and that employees, agents, attachés, or whatever they may be called, are more capable and more satisfactory than will in all probability be the case if appointments are determined practically altogether by civil-service examination.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I remind the gentleman in this connection that almost the identical plan, just announced by him, is in practice in selecting consuls and secretaries of embassies and legations in the Department of State, so that there are two analogies as opposed to the one proposed in this bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Is not the gentleman impressed that that plan would work better than if we turned the whole matter over practically to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it has worked extremely well so far as the character of the personnel in the State Department is concerned, and also as to the Department of Commerce.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I make that suggestion to the chairman of the committee and the members of the Committee on Agriculture. The plans in force in the Department of Commerce and in the Department of State have evidently worked well. They provide for an examination by which applicants for appointment in each case appear before a board and submit to an examination. They can be looked over and their qualities can be investigated and determined, whereas in many, if not all, examinations by the Civil Service Commission candidates do not appear; examinations are all in writing. Stock questions, often more or less so, are asked, and unfortunate results are often reached, and unworthy and incompetent persons are employed. This bill will provide very important positions, and the men and women appointed to them ought to be carefully selected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It would seem to me that the plans that have worked so well in other departments ought to be adopted, and my only purpose is to have the best possible selections made. I approve heartily of the purpose of the bill. I suggest that more attention be given to plans that are in vogue now in the other departments. Are we not giving, under the bill, too much authority to the Civil Service Commission—asking too much of them, taking too great a chance in making selections solely by a written examination by a commission that never sees the applicants? These are not criticisms; at least not unfriendly ones. I do not say what I have because I am in any sense opposed to the bill. I favor it, as does the Committee on Agriculture. I appreciate the desirability of having this work done; but a great deal depends upon the character of the men to be employed. I wish the best possible plan of selection to be provided and followed.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The amendment which has been worked out was worked out in a conference between the two departments, and I take it it is along the policy of the Department of State.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. As I heard it read, it does not seem to me that it embodies the idea that I have suggested to the committee. Too much is left to the Civil Service Commission. There is no provision for an examination by a qualified board in the department. I am not so familiar with the working of the board in the State Department, but in the Department of Commerce selection is made by a board appointed by the Secretary of officials of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. The personnel of that board is not always the same. Selections are made having in mind the character of work to be done and the part of the world into which the applicant is to be sent.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think that for this type of service abroad the oral examination is of prime importance?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I would think that it is of more importance than a written examination.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The man who is an expert at his books and who may pass the examination may prove to be an extremely unfortunate representative of the United States abroad.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes; and the gentleman understands that applicants who are given an oral examination are only those who pass satisfactorily written examinations conducted by the Civil Service Commission. In that way those who are incompetent or who do not show themselves as qualified as far as educational requirements go do not come before the board for oral examination. The portions of the bill to which I have directed attention are very important, and I suggest that more care be given to drafting them. As I understand it, the only examination provided for is to be conducted by the Civil Service Commission according to its rules and regulations, many of which we know a great deal about and results of which are in many instances not satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON to the committee amendment: After the word "attachés," in the fifth line of subdivision (3) of the amendment, add the words "as Congress from time to time may authorize."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want only a minute. At present the number of the new attachés which could be appointed under this bill is unlimited. It is all right for the Secretary to attach the ones that we now have over there as agricultural attachés. I do not object to that, but such new ones as he desires to appoint ought first to be authorized by Congress.

We ought to retain control over this matter of the Treasury purse strings. Now, if Congress does not want to do it, of course it can not be helped, but I appeal to you gentlemen that we ought to retain it. We ought to say to all of them, when you want employees, come to Congress and tell us. We can provide them very easily here. Let me call attention to this. While they do not have to be appointed through the civil service you are providing a civil-service status for them, and when once appointed you can not get rid of them. They are on the pay roll for life. You might have a Secretary of Agriculture who would appoint more than should be appointed, and you can not get rid of them thereafter because they have a civil-service status. Do you want to do that? We are not objecting to the purpose of the bill in requiring that the Secre-

tary shall come to Congress if there are new attachés needed. I wish the committee would adopt this amendment, as it ought to be passed.

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. STENGLE. I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of entering into this discussion, but we have been traveling far afield in the last few minutes in the very pleasurable pastime of seeking to attack the Federal Civil Service Commission, and in many instances we have gone far afield from the truth. It is only right that we try to stick to the facts. My friend from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] referred to the necessity for various kinds of tests, and my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] impressed upon us the necessity of the oral examination. Now, it is just as well that we understand the plan of procedure in order to obtain this class of candidates. I believe I am fairly well acquainted with the procedure in the Federal civil service as well as in some of the larger cities. In a case like this, of a scientific nature, where it is of great importance to secure experienced and qualified men for attachés in foreign places for a specific public purpose, the first thing that your commission does is to sit in conference with the head of the department that is to make the appointment and go over the necessary subjects and discuss the requirements before they announce the test, and after they have done that, divide that test by giving experience a certain weight, a written test a certain weight, have an oral examination for the purpose of looking a man over to see whether his personality is such that he can meet the requirements of that particular position. It is only fair we have these facts before us before we electrocute the Civil Service Commission without any regard to the other facts.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENGLE. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. How does the gentleman stand on my amendment? Does not the gentleman want to retain the power here and control over these employees?

Mr. STENGLE. I only want to say in reply to the gentleman from Texas that I went a long way with him until he stated something that was not the fact.

Mr. BLANTON. What was that?

Mr. STENGLE. He said this: If you get these men in the civil service, you can not get them out. If you have too many, you can not reduce the number. Those are not the facts. A man can be laid off for lack of work or lack of appropriation at any time by the head of any department.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will yield, 65,000 of them are retained now, as against 37,000 when we entered the war, and we can not lay them off to save our souls.

Mr. STENGLE. But the fact remains that you can lay them off if you want to lay them off.

Mr. BLANTON. But they have not done it.

Mr. STENGLE. I can not answer that question, unless you allow me to read the minds of department heads.

Mr. HAUGEN. I desire to say that they have seven now in the service, and if additional are required the amendment will require an authorization of Congress. I think it is not necessary to come to Congress to ask for an authorization every time an additional employee is required, and I trust the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Can the gentleman from Iowa tell us what the rank or grade of these appointees will be? Will they be of the grade of commercial attachés, as are now employed by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, or will they be of the grade of trade commissioners that are appointed by that bureau?

Mr. HAUGEN. That, of course, can be determined by the reclassification.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think I can answer that question, if the gentleman will permit. A trade commissioner is not accredited through the Secretary of State to a foreign country.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am speaking of employees or agents of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Commerce Department.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand, and I am answering the question. The commercial attachés of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce are accredited through the

Department of State to an embassy or legation and therefore have what is technically called a diplomatic standing. The purpose of the bill offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] is to give agricultural attachés also a diplomatic standing, utilizing the same method of accrediting them abroad. Lesser officials or particularized officials, either of the Department of Commerce or of the Agricultural Department, will not have that special diplomatic standing and will be in a secondary category.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Of course, our commercial attachés have very important positions, very high officials, and there are comparatively few over the world, only 17 I believe, with salaries ranging from \$5,000 up to \$8,500 a year. Of the trade commissioners there are a large number, but they are of a lower grade and their salaries range from \$4,500, I believe, to \$7,500. But I was thinking possibly that appointees under this bill will have a grade corresponding to the grade of some similar employees in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Can the gentleman give any idea of the grade of these men?

Mr. HAUGEN. If not determined by the reclassification, it will be for Congress to determine what the salaries are.

In the past Congress has been fixing salaries for the various employees. Now under the reclassification act the salaries are determined by the classification.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If they have any relation whatever to, or are comparable with, the officials I have spoken of, the trade commissioners and the commercial attachés, their salaries will not be fixed by Congress. The number of them and the salary of each will be determined entirely by the department and will depend solely on the total amount of the appropriation available for the purpose.

Mr. HAUGEN. Unless a limitation is placed on the appropriation?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. As the law now stands and as the bill reads, there is no limitation whatever on the number or on the amount of salary. It is a little unusual, and in my judgment it is not a good way to legislate. I will not complain or suggest a change, but will just say to the House, what many Members know, that the number is entirely determined, and the salary of each and every one is determined, by the total amount of the appropriation which Congress will from time to time make for the kind of work to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment. After the word "attachés," in section 3, third line, strike out all down to and including the word "competency."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LINTHICUM: Line 3 of subsection 3 of the amendment, strike out, after the word "attachés," all the remainder of line 3 and all of lines 4, 5, 6, and 7 down to and including the word "competency."

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, my idea about that is just this: According to this amendment, any number of attachés can be appointed by the Department of Agriculture and then designated by the Department of State to the various United States embassies and legations to which they are assigned.

Now, I am opposed to increasing the number of employees; we have too many already. I do not think we need them. We have at the present time special attachés of the Department of Commerce and with these it seems that the members of the staffs of the consulates and embassies can certainly look after the agricultural interests of the country as well as these proposed men could do.

Mr. ASWELL. How could the Department of Agriculture increase the number without it first being acted upon by the Committee on Appropriations and Congress?

Mr. LINTHICUM. The amendment gives them the right to make appointments. Of course they will have to get the appropriations to pay them. But has the gentleman ever known a case where Congress refused to appropriate for the men who have been appointed?

Mr. BLANTON. If so, that was before I came here.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman please read the language as amended by him?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have already read the amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it based on the printed text?

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is based on the amendment itself. We have in every one of these consulates a large staff of men, and up to the time of the war those men were able to attend to everything, including our commercial interests, and to-day they are able to attend to them. But during the war, or just before the war, we created these special attachés, and they are doing absolutely the same work as the members of the staffs of the consulates are doing, and now we are proposing an additional man at these consulates to be called "the agricultural attaché."

If you are going to do that you will have a staff at the consulate to do the work, and the attaché under the Department of Commerce, and then the attaché under the Department of Agriculture. Where are you going to stop? Are you going to give a representation in the embassies, legations, and consulates to every branch of the Government and to every industry? After a while we shall have duplication in all this work. It simply means larger appropriations, more job holders, and more taxation. I tell you, gentlemen, it does not make any difference how many men you appoint to foreign countries, whether they be agricultural attachés, commercial attachés, or what not, you will never increase the foreign business of our country until you lower the tariff wall that you have established and until you have reestablished the nations of the world so that they are financially able to do business with us. [Applause.] All the solicitation you can do will not increase our foreign markets until we give the people in the foreign countries a chance to deal with us.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I yield.

Mr. WINSLOW. Perhaps inadvertently the gentleman made the statement that the consuls had been doing all the business that is done by the commercial attachés.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I said that prior to the war the staffs at the consulates were able to attend to all the business of our country abroad; yes.

Mr. WINSLOW. Can you say that they are able to attend to it now, with the addition of business since that time?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I say that the staffs at the consulates can attend to the affairs just as well as you can have it done with representation by the Department of Commerce and by the Department of Agriculture. If you have not a sufficient number of men to do the work appoint additional men, but not men under the Department of Commerce or under the Department of Agriculture. Let them represent the various industries of our country but under the Department of State. Appoint where necessary but limit to that.

Mr. WINSLOW. Why did they not do it before the war?

Mr. LINTHICUM. They did it before the war.

Mr. WINSLOW. Not a tenth part of what has been done along commercial and agricultural lines since.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is because business throughout the world with the United States increased.

Mr. WINSLOW. Now?

Mr. LINTHICUM. During the war.

Mr. WINSLOW. But since the war?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Since the war it has been pretty good, but since the passage of the tariff bill it has been very poor, and will continue so; and all the agricultural attachés you may appoint will not change it. You must remove the cause if you wish to increase our foreign business. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. BLANTON. There is one important amendment that has not been acted upon.

Mr. RANKIN. We have discussed this for three hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has made the motion that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. BLANTON. I move to amend that, so that it shall close in eight minutes, five of which shall be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the motion made by the gentleman from Mississippi that all debate shall be closed in a minute and a half.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment that all debate close in a minute and a half.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi as amended.

The motion as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 3, line 6, after the word "employees," insert the words "as from time to time may be authorized by Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment can only be offered for information at this point, because it is not an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. I thought they were closing all debate on the entire bill, and I want my minute and a half on the next section, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there is no next section, and there are about 45 seconds left of the time fixed for debate.

Mr. BLANTON. The time for debate was a minute and a half, and not for other matters. The Chair will readily see that the time is for debate and does not cover any other matter. I ask recognition on this amendment for a minute and a half.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has been read and can be read only for information. If the gentleman wants to be recognized on his amendment he can be recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. I prefer to wait until the committee amendment has been voted on.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 6, after the word "employees," insert the words "as from time to time may be authorized by Congress."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if you want to keep control of the number of Government employees you should adopt this amendment, but if you do not you can vote it down.

I am going to offer another amendment in a minute which will provide for controlling the amount of expenses to "such as authorized by Congress." I will not have a chance to debate it so I mention it now. If you want to control the expenses of this foreign organization you should vote for this second amendment. Of course, if you do not, all right. I am doing my duty in presenting it to you, and when I have presented it to you I have done my full duty in trying to effect economy. If you can not agree with me I am a good sport and will say all right. But I want to say that we ought to control the number of employees and we ought to control the amount of expenses.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. STENGLE] awhile ago said we could get rid of Government employees. I told him we had over 65,000 right now as against 37,000 when we went into the war in 1917. Why do we not get rid of them if we can do it? I will tell you why. You once put them on the pay roll and they will not let a Congressman get rid of them. If the department declares them surplus and seeks to discharge them they immediately come to you and you take them down and say to the department, "Put them back," and they are put back. That is what happens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. I am going to make a motion in order to have no misunderstanding. I move that all debate on this bill do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the effect of the motion already adopted.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to the bill as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 10, noes 38.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment for the introduction of a new section to the bill as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WINSLOW: Page 3, line 13, after the word "Congress" insert:

"Sec. 2. Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting the functions under existing law of any other department or independent establishment of the United States, or of any officer, agent, or employee thereof."

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, all there is to that—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that debate has been closed.

Mr. WINSLOW. Upon the section that was before the committee. This is a new section.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that for the purpose of debate as ruled by all Chairmen, and I call attention to the very lengthy opinion rendered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], to the effect that any subsequent new section for the purposes of debate is considered a part of the preceding section.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW] does not desire to be heard upon his amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 28, noes 27.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WINSLOW and Mr. JONES.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 34, noes 46.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I make the point of no quorum, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland makes the point of order there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After a pause.] One hundred and eight Members present, a quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 3, line 7, after the word "expenditures," insert the words "as Congress may authorize."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call attention to the fact that we have passed that section and there was a new section offered.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I was trying to offer this—I told the Chair I had an amendment to the third section when the Chair recognized the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I was on my feet urging and doing everything I could to get in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair heard the gentleman say in debate that he proposed to offer an amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. And I tried to offer it.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas understands his rights on this floor. His was a preferential amendment, and he knows how to get his rights here. Nobody has to instruct him. He had his right to offer it as a preferential amendment, and the gentleman could have stopped the other amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but I can not pull the Chair off of the bench.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman can almost do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was watching the gentleman from Texas to see whether he proposed to offer the amendment and he made no effort to offer it.

Mr. BLANTON. I did the best I could to offer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, I am used to the steam roller and submit to the ruling of the Chair and reserve my exception.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a new section at the end of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts: At the end of the bill insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 2. Agricultural attachés may be removed at the pleasure of the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, debate is not exhausted upon this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Not on a new section.  
Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have just a word to say—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that debate on the bill has been closed.

The CHAIRMAN. Not on a new section.

Mr. RANKIN. On the whole bill. I rose and made a motion that debate close on the entire bill, and the Chair informed me that that had already been done by my previous motion.

The CHAIRMAN. There was then pending a motion to close debate on the section and all amendments thereto.

Mr. RANKIN. And I rose later.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair remembers that the gentleman from Mississippi was on his feet. If the gentleman from Mississippi now wishes to make a motion to close debate upon the bill, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. RANKIN. I have made that motion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I can not be taken off my feet for that purpose, I suppose?

Mr. RANKIN. I made the motion a while ago, and if the Chair recognizes me I renew that motion now, that all debate on this bill do now close.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I heard the gentleman make the motion, but the question was not put, and the Chair did not recognize the gentleman for that purpose at that time.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have only a word to say in support of the amendment which, I understand, is satisfactory to the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I have a right to have the Chair rule on my motion, to say the least of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's motion was not put.

Mr. RANKIN. I put the motion, and the Chair asked me a moment ago if I renewed the motion, and I made the motion that all debate on this bill do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not recognize the gentleman to make the motion and the Chair did not put the question.

Mr. RANKIN. I made the motion awhile ago, and the Chair informed me that had already been done, and now the proposition is to open debate again, and I submit I am entitled to have my motion put to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the situation. The gentleman from Massachusetts sought recognition upon his proposed new section. Some one made the point of order that debate had been closed upon the entire bill. The Chair then stated that the motion that was passed was to close debate upon the section and all amendments thereto. Thereupon, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Winslow] desisted from his attempt to secure recognition and withdrew his request for recognition.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me remind the Chair that this is what happened—

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANKIN. I have a point of order pending.

Mr. ASWELL. I have a right to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that, but you have no right to do that until I get through with this point of order. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Winslow] rose, and I said to the Chair that in order that there might be no misunderstanding about it I would make the motion to close debate on the entire bill, and the Chair informed me that had already been done.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASWELL. Is it in order now to move that all debate close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts insists that he has been recognized.

Mr. ASWELL. I would like to have the Chair decide that.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, can we not settle this thing. I only want two minutes. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto be closed in two minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to have the Chair rule on the proposition. I think this matter ought to be settled in the right way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Mississippi is correct. At that time the Chair was under the impression that debate had been closed on the entire bill, because it then consisted of only one section.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I am willing to accept the proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Rogers].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Rogers] proceeding for two minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RANKIN. That is with the understanding that all debate close in two minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the amendment which I have offered simply gives the Secretary of Agriculture the right to remove any agricultural attaché at any time. These men go forth over the world in a quasi diplomatic function. They will be called upon to perform delicate and difficult and intricate duties. If they are to be completely responsive to the foreign policy of the United States, they must be removable at any time, without the necessity of complying with the elaborate formula which is required in the case of the removal of civil-service employees generally.

This amendment will give the foreign work of the Department of Agriculture the flexibility which it needs. The amendment is satisfactory to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and to the author of the bill. I hope it will be accepted by the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor have the same power?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. Each has the power to remove without cause their agents in the foreign field. The ambassadors in Paris and London and the secretaries of the embassies and legations must be removable at any time in order that the foreign functions of the Government may be efficiently performed and may be responsive to the policy of the Government of the United States. The authority has never been abused.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Are any of the attachés under the civil service?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. None of them. This bill questionably puts agricultural attachés under the civil service. I want to overcome the objection in respect to the removal feature, which would otherwise result from giving them a civil-service status.

Mr. CLANCY. A parliamentary inquiry. If this amendment should be adopted, would it not kill the provisions of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Rogers].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise—

Mr. RUBEXY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUBEXY. Is it in order to move to lay the bill aside and call up another bill without the committee rising?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union is sitting for the purpose of considering this particular bill, and the order of the House can not be changed in committee.

Mr. HAUGEN. I move that the committee do now rise, report the bill back to the House with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7111) to promote American agriculture by making more extensively available by expanding the service now rendered by the Department of Agriculture in gathering and disseminating information regarding agricultural production, competition, and demand in foreign countries in promoting the sale of farm products abroad, and in other ways, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit this bill to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the

same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I am.

The Clerk read the motion to recommit, as follows:

In line 5 of subdivision (3) of the committee amendment, after the word "attachés," insert "as from time to time may be authorized by Congress," and on page 3, in line 6, after the word "employees," add "as from time to time may be authorized by Congress," and on page 3, in line 7, after the word "expenditures," add "as may be authorized by Congress."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. This motion to recommit is not in order. It seeks to amend an amendment already adopted in the House.

Mr. BLANTON. But, Mr. Speaker, the previous question on the motion to recommit has been ordered.

The SPEAKER. No; the Chair did not recognize the gentleman from Iowa to move the previous question.

Mr. BLANTON. None of these amendments have been agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The form of the gentleman's motion to recommit says an amendment to an amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; an amendment to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. That has been adopted by the House. That is not in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I offer it with the first part, referring to the committee amendment, left out. I offer it with regard to page 3, lines 6 and 7.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 6, strike out lines 6 to 23, inclusive, and insert: On page 3, in line 6, after the word "employees," add "as from time to time may be authorized by Congress," and on page 3, in line 7, after the word "expenditures," add "as may be authorized by Congress."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BLANTON. I desire to say a word on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered.

Mr. BLANTON. But the Chair has just stated he did not recognize the gentleman to move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Not on the motion to recommit, but the previous question has been ordered on the bill and all amendments to final passage, and that covers the motion to recommit. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was being taken, and Mr. LINTHICUM made the point of order that no quorum was present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland makes the point of order that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and nine Members present; not a quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the motion was lost.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 33, nays 222, not voting 177, as follows:

YEAS—33

Allen	Garner, Tex.	O'Connell, R. I.	Tucker
Allgood	Gilbert	Oliver, Ala.	Upshaw
Black, Tex.	Howard, Nebr.	Park, Ga.	Vinson, Ky.
Bland	Huddleston	Richards	Williams, Tex.
Blanton	Jeffers	Sanders, Tex.	Woodrum
Box	Larsen, Ga.	Taylor, W. Va.	Wright
Brand, Ga.	Lilly	Thomas, Ky.	
Buchanan	Linthicum	Thomas, Okla.	
Busby	Moore, Ga.	Tillman	

NAYS—222

Ackerman	Burton	Cramton	Faust
Almon	Byrns, Tenn.	Croll	Fenn
Arnold	Cable	Cummings	Fisher
Aswell	Campbell	Dallinger	Fitzgerald
Ayres	Canfield	Davis, Minn.	Foster
Bankhead	Cannon	Davis, Tenn.	Fredericks
Barbour	Casey	Denison	Eree
Barkley	Chindblom	Dickinson, Iowa	Freeman
Beck	Clague	Dickinson, Mo.	French
Beedy	Clarke, N. Y.	Dominick	Fulbright
Begg	Cleary	Dowell	Fuller
Berger	Cole, Iowa	Doyle	Fulmer
Boyes	Cole, Ohio	Drowry	Garber
Brand, Ohio	Collifer	Driver	Gardner, Ind.
Briggs	Colton	Elliott	Garrett, Tenn.
Browning	Connally, Tex.	Evans, Iowa	Garrett, Tex.
Burdick	Connerly	Evans, Mont.	Gasque
Burtness	Cook	Fairchild	Glatteiter
	Cooper, Wis.	Fairfield	Graham, Ill.

Greene, Mass.	Lankford	Newton, Minn.	Stedman
Greenwood	Lazaro	O'Sullivan	Stengle
Hadley	Lea, Calif.	Oldfield	Stevens
Hardy	Leavitt	Peery	Strong, Kans.
Harrison	Lehbach	Porter	Summers, Wash.
Hastings	Lineberger	Pon	Swank
Haugen	Little	Purnell	Swing
Hawley	Longworth	Quin	Swoope
Hayden	Lowrey	Rainey	Taylor, Tenn.
Hersey	Lozier	Raker	Temple
Hickey	Luce	Rankin	Thompson
Hill, Ala.	McKeown	Ransley	Tilson
Hill, Md.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Rayburn	Timberlake
Hill, Wash.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Reece	Tincher
Hoch	McReynolds	Reed, Ark.	Tinkham
Holiday	McSwain	Roach	Treadway
Hooker	MacGregor	Robinson, Iowa	Underwood
Hudson	MacLafferty	Robson, Ky.	Vincent, Mich.
Hudspeth	Magee, N. Y.	Rogers, Mass.	Vinson, Ga.
Hull, Morton D.	Major, Mo.	Romjue	Wainwright
Hull, Iowa	Manlove	Rubey	Watkins
Jacobstein	Mapes	Sabath	Watres
James	Martin	Salmon	Weaver
Johnson, Ky.	Merritt	Sandlin	Wefald
Johnson, Tex.	Michener	Schafer	Weller
Johnson, W. Va.	Miller, Wash.	Schneider	Welsh
Jones	Milligan	Sears, Nebr.	White, Kans.
Kearns	Minahan	Shallenbeger	White, Me.
Keller	Mooney	Shreve	Williamson
Kendall	Moore, Ohio	Simmons	Wilson, Ind.
Ketcham	Moore, Ind.	Sinclair	Wilson, La.
Kincheloe	Morehead	Sinnott	Wingo
Kopp	Morgan	Sites	Winslow
Kunz	Morrow	Smith	Wolf
Kvale	Murphy	Smithwick	Woodruff
Lampert	Nelson, Me.	Speaks	
Lanham	Nelson, Wis.	Sproul, Kans.	

NOT VOTING—177

Abernethy	Egan	McFadden	Sanders, Ind.
Aldrich	Edmonds	McKenzie	Sanders, N. Y.
Anderson	Favrot	McLeod	Schall
Andrew	Fish	McNulty	Scott
Anthony	Fleetwood	McSweeney	Sears, Fla.
Bacharach	Frear	Madden	Seger
Bacon	Frothingham	Magee, Pa.	Sherwood
Beers	Funk	Major, Ill.	Snell
Bell	Gallivan	Mansfield	Snyder
Bixler	Geran	Mead	Sproul, Ill.
Black, N. Y.	Gibson	Michaelson	Stalker
Bloom	Gifford	Miller, Ill.	Steagall
Bowling	Goldsborough	Mills	Stevenson
Boylan	Graham, Pa.	Montague	Strong, Pa.
Britten	Green, Iowa	Moore, Ill.	Sullivan
Browne, N. J.	Griest	Moore, Va.	Summers, Tex.
Browne, Wis.	Griffin	Morin	Sweet
Brunn	Hammer	Morris	Taber
Buckley	Hawes	Mudd	Tague
Bulwinkle	Howard, Okla.	Newton, Mo.	Taylor, Colo.
Butler	Hull, William E.	Nolan	Thatcher
Byrnes, S. C.	Hull, Tenn.	O'Brien	Tydings
Carew	Humphreys	O'Connell, N. Y.	Underhill
Carter	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Connor, La.	Vaile
Celler	Johnson, Wash.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Vare
Christopherson	Jost	Oliver, N. Y.	Vestal
Clancy	Kahn	Paige	Voigt
Clark, Fla.	Kelly	Parker	Ward, N. Y.
Collins	Kent	Parks, Ark.	Ward, N. C.
Connolly, Pa.	Kerr	Patterson	Wason
Cooper, Ohio	Kiess	Peavey	Watson
Corning	Kindred	Perkin	Wertz
Crisp	King	Periman	Williams, Ill.
Crosser	Knutson	Phillips	Williams, Miss.
Crowthier	Kurtz	Prall	Wilson
Cullen	LaGuardia	Quayle	Winter
Curry	Langley	Ragon	Wood
Darrow	Larson, Minn.	Ramseyer	Wurzbach
Davey	Leatherwood	Rathbone	Wyant
Deal	Ler, Ga.	Reed, N. Y.	Yates
Dempsey	Lindsay	Reed, W. Va.	Young
Dickstein	Logan	Reid, Ill.	Zihlman
Doughton	Lyon	Rogers, N. H.	
Drane	McClintic	Rosenbloom	
	McDuffie	Rouse	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:  
Until further notice:

- Mr. Wason with Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire.
- Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.
- Mr. Patterson with Mr. Drane.
- Mr. Cooper of Ohio with Mr. Byrnes of South Carolina.
- Mr. Wyant with Mr. Bulwinkle.
- Mr. Gibson with Mr. Logan.
- Mr. Morin with Mr. Hawes.
- Mr. Kahn with Mr. Prall.
- Mr. Parker with Mr. Doughton.
- Mr. Vare with Mr. Collins.
- Mr. Bixler with Mr. Wilson of Mississippi.
- Mr. Perlman with Mr. Geran.
- Mr. Reed of West Virginia with Mr. Carew.
- Mr. Paige with Mr. Major of Illinois.
- Mr. Johnson of Washington with Mr. Celler.
- Mr. Kelly with Mr. Cullen.
- Mr. Watson with Mr. Black of New York.
- Mr. Brumm with Mr. McNulty.
- Mr. Anthony with Mr. O'Connell of New York.
- Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Bowling.
- Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Tydings.
- Mr. Butler with Mr. Crisp.
- Mr. McFadden with Mr. Stevenson.
- Mr. King with Mr. Favrot.
- Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Oliver of New York.
- Mr. Perkins with Mr. Tague.

Mr. Seger with Mr. Morris.  
 Mr. Magee of Pennsylvania with Mr. Dickstein.  
 Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Browne of New Jersey.  
 Mr. Thatcher with Mr. Howard of Oklahoma.  
 Mr. Anderson with Mr. Griffin.  
 Mr. Green of Iowa with Mr. Hammer.  
 Mr. Greist with Mr. Sullivan.  
 Mr. Bacon with Mr. Kent.  
 Mr. Vaile with Mr. Moore of Georgia.  
 Mr. Young with Mr. Lee of Georgia.  
 Mr. Underhill with Mr. McSweeney.  
 Mr. Larson of Minnesota with Mr. Bloom.  
 Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Bell.  
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Carter.  
 Mr. Kiess with Mr. Sherwood.  
 Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Steagall.  
 Mrs. Nolan with Mr. Montague.  
 Mr. Darrow with Mr. Quayle.  
 Mr. Snell with Mr. O'Connor of New York.  
 Mr. McLeod with Mr. Boylan.  
 Mr. Kurtz with Mr. Abernethy.  
 Mr. Winter with Mr. McDuffie.  
 Mr. Frear with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.  
 Mr. Crowther with Mr. Ragon.  
 Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Jost.  
 Mr. Williams of Illinois with Mr. O'Connor of Louisiana.  
 Mr. Newton of Missouri with Mr. Corning.  
 Mr. Funk with Mr. Davey.  
 Mr. Stalker with Mr. Humphreys.  
 Mr. Miller of Illinois with Mr. Buckley.  
 Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. O'Brien.  
 Mr. Mudd with Mr. Kindred.  
 Mr. Taber with Mr. McClintic.  
 Mr. Sproul of Illinois with Mr. Mansfield.  
 Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Gasque.  
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.  
 Mr. Schall with Mr. Parks of Arkansas.  
 Mr. Beers with Mr. Sears of Florida.  
 Mr. Curry with Mr. Mead.  
 Mr. Christopherson with Mr. Summers of Texas.  
 Mr. Frothingham with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.  
 Mr. Snyder with Mr. Lyons.  
 Mr. Reid of Illinois with Mr. Kerr.  
 Mr. Thompson with Mr. Lindsay.  
 Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Goldsborough.  
 Mr. Sanders of Indiana with Mr. Deal.  
 Mr. Warabach with Mr. Eagan.  
 Mr. Rathbone with Mr. Crosser.  
 Mr. Wertz with Mr. Clancy.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were reopened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to promote American agriculture by making more extensively available and by expanding the service now rendered by the Department of Agriculture in gathering and disseminating information regarding agricultural production, competition, and demand in foreign countries in promoting the sale of farm products abroad, and in other ways."

On motion of Mr. HAUGEN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### REFORESTATION

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4830) to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up the bill H. R. 4830. This bill is on the Union Calendar. The House will automatically resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4830, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this reforestation bill is a bill that comes out of the Agriculture Committee by a unanimous vote. It has the indorsement of the Bureau of the Budget, and is a forward looking step in a comprehensive conservation plan of establishing a national reforestation policy. No man who has given any thought to the great subject of reforestation but knows that this problem is an imminent one, and in order to get something that should avoid all controversial features, the great Committee on Agriculture of this House spent weeks in the consider-

ation of the problems and hearings of the multiplicity of interest involved in order to get the facts and information so that it could outline a comprehensive law—something to build on not alone for this day, but something to look forward to as our duty to the to-morrows. In addition to the hearings of our Committee on Agriculture, a select committee of the Senate was appointed which went out into 16 States and held 24 different meetings, so that all of the interest involved and all people who had given serious thought to the problem of reforestation could appear before this committee to present reasons why such a policy should be adopted and what that policy should be.

They came forward and the bill now under consideration, H. R. 4830, represents not alone the unanimous report of the Agriculture Committee, but also represents the unanimous report of the select committee of the United States Senate.

I wish now to explain to you in detail something of what this bill means, the purposes of the bill, if you please. It is a great cooperative effort, cooperative in the sense that the Federal Government, if this bill is enacted into law, will cooperate with the States, will cooperate with private agencies within the States under State supervision, in an effort to get going a national policy and get to growing trees upon our hills also too badly needed.

Sections 1 and 2. The purpose of these two sections is that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to devise and recommend an adequate system of forest protection and fire prevention in the several States and, if there is cooperation, to extend financial cooperation to such States. These sections extend that cooperation now extended under section 2 of the Weeks Act. We have now a fairly successful fire-prevention system, but in the face of that we now have 50,000 forest fires annually over 8,000,000 acres, so we need a greater and larger cooperation because 75 per cent of the losses that come in our forests come from fires and this bill is a forward-looking step in that direction.

Section 3 provides for an extensive study of the tax laws of the States, for just taxation comes next to fire prevention as a factor of encouragement in promoting and encouraging reforestation. Private enterprise needs that encouragement to go forward on the denuded lands, the cut-over lands and to set out trees and not fear that the tax assessor is going to pounce upon them when 10 or 20 years have gone with unfair appraisals tending to discourage or prevent the growing of trees.

Section 4 contemplates the cooperation of Federal and State Governments in the furnishing of forest tree seeds or plants and the procuring and distribution of the same. In these great United States to-day there are 81,000,000 acres of denuded land suitable for reforestation, and it is worthy of note that in the entire United States but 30,000 acres were planted and reforested in the year 1922, and yet little Japan in that same year multiplied by 10 times (300,000 acres) the acreage that was set out to trees in the United States.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I certainly will.

Mr. ALMON. The gentleman has stated the purpose of the bill, among other things, was to get trees to grow on our barren hills. I would like for the gentleman to give some idea about the character and what lands are to be reforested and by whom they are owned, whether by individuals, corporations, or by the United States Government.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Well, there is a large amount, probably 80 per cent of the denuded lands of the United States, in private ownership. Many of these millions of acres are cut-over lands. They are more suitable for the growing of trees than for agricultural purposes. They are also needed for the protection of the stream flow of our navigable streams.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I will.

Mr. RAKER. I am very much interested in the gentleman's discussion and the provisions of this bill. I had occasion to make some examination of the laws practically of all the States with regard to this subject; received them from the various secretaries of those States. Has the committee made any such study of the laws of Pennsylvania regarding reforestation?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Well, that is one of the very purposes of this bill; we have secured much tax data and other information that is now in no particular place. This information will be placed before the proper organization in their States.

Mr. RAKER. This thing I want to bring to the attention of the gentleman and to the committee: Has the committee gone into the method that Pennsylvania uses in acquiring pri-

vately owned land for the State forests, and then the method of the State in handling these lands with respect to taxation after acquiring them?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. We have. If the gentleman will look at the hearings, he will find we heard not alone Mr. Gifford Pinchot, of the State of Pennsylvania, but we heard other students of the reforestation problem from Pennsylvania. However, this information was not alone submitted to our committee of the House but was also submitted, in the final days of the hearings, to the select committee of the Senate.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Surely.

Mr. RAKER. Did the committee come to any conclusion as to the advisability of the Government taking over these cut-over lands, which can be bought now at a nominal price—whole counties—and the States return for what they would receive for taxes if they remained in private ownership?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Some States are now getting returns where reforested lands are being cut through a severance tax. I think the return is about 25 per cent that is going back to the States.

Mr. RAKER. For instance, Pennsylvania has a piece of land which is returned to the State; the State owns it and the State itself pays that county the amount a private individual would pay for a like amount. Has the gentleman's committee gone into that?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Yes; the gentleman will find in the hearings of the select committee of the Senate that very proposition was fully discussed, and it was given very full consideration by our committee.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman one more question?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Certainly.

Mr. RAKER. The committee, then, has not determined whether or not they are willing now to provide a plan whereby the Federal Government would pay and return to the county or the State wherein the Federal Government has taken over the private cut-over lands an amount equal to the amount that the county would obtain if the land had remained in private ownership?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. In answer to that, of course, the question of taxation is primarily a question for the States to determine. It is true that practically only three or four States of the Union to-day have laws that meet the situation to encourage private owners to go into the growing of trees. In those States we authorize \$100,000 to be expended for the study of the taxation laws of the States, by States and by forest regions, because in many cases the forest region overlaps the boundaries of States. We think that through the appeal that can be made by a careful study of these laws we can get the States to go on more rapidly than they are now doing in the solution of this tax problem. It is primarily a matter for the States to attend to.

Mr. RAKER. Suppose there are 100,000 acres of cut-over land in Plumas County, Calif. The Government can take that over at a nominal price. Will the gentleman provide in this bill that it shall be returned to the county of Plumas by the Federal Government—the amount that it now receives from the private individuals for taxes who own the land?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I will say to the gentleman that not exactly that question has come before us in our hearings, but almost that identical question. We have tried to keep out all controversial features from this bill.

Mr. RAKER. I see.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. For the very reason that we feel that now, when we are getting our reforestation problem going, and in order to get it going more rapidly we are not considering the question of supervision of the cuttings and slashings and the burning of slashings and the other propositions of privately owned lands, it is preeminently necessary to keep away from these controversial constitutional questions, and we say "Here are the fundamental, noncontroversial propositions that the best minds have arrived at in the consideration of these questions," and we give them to you urging a speedy answer.

Mr. RAKER. Did the committee go into the legal feature, that if the Federal Government desired it, it could to-day pass a law requiring private individuals who own timberlands to cut the timber on their land so as not to destroy the watershed that now feeds the navigable streams and thereafter they would have to cut their lands as the Federal Government does it?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. What three States does the gentleman refer to? Mr. CLARKE of New York. Massachusetts, Louisiana, and New York.

Mr. LITTLE. And Pennsylvania?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. The gentleman answered a former question that I propounded, and said that about 80 per cent of the lands that are to be reforested are owned now by private individuals. What interest would the Federal Government have in that private property after it was reforested, or what control or supervision would it have over it, and what interest would it have in it other than the general interest that it owes to the public?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Primarily it is a general interest.

Mr. ALMON. If the Government goes into the reforestation of cut-over lands owned by private individuals, what interest would the Government have in that land or timber, or what supervision would the Government have over it, or what interest would the people of the United States have in it other than the general interest which it has in preserving the timbers of the country?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. That is primarily the purpose of the bill.

Section 6 amends the Weeks Act, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to recommend and authorize for purchase such forested, cut-over, or denuded land within the watersheds of navigable streams as, in his judgment, may be necessary to the regulation of the flow of navigable streams or for the production of timber, and to report to the National Forest Preservation Commission the result of such examination. It does not remove the limitation upon the acquisition, and it must be within the watersheds of navigable streams. If you will study section 6, I think you will find the answer to some of the questions just asked me.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Surely.

Mr. RAKER. What I contend for is this, and there is no such law on the statute books: In the privately owned timberland where the land has been denuded—and there are privately owned lands that have not been denuded—that timber holds the water which makes a constant supply which feeds the stream and makes the river navigable.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Therefore if the Federal Government passed a law requiring a man to cut timber so as not to destroy the natural development of it and the watershed, he would have to cut it in such a way as not to produce barren land that dries up our rivers.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Yes. This section 7 supplements the right to purchase on the part of the Government by authorizing the Government to accept by gift, bequest, or devise such lands as may be offered. It is to be noticed that over 400,000 acres were involved in one case where the owners were willing to turn that cut-over land over to the Government and the Government had no power to accept it. That is where you can handle it in an economical way as a forest region. This provides for the acceptance of land. Even these great lumbermen are public spirited, and they realize that if the Federal Government does not take a hand in this work they can not well do it all.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again for a question?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. This question is so vitally interesting to the Western States that I am sorry that I was not able to present the facts and data that I have to the committee. Would your committee be willing now to study, preparatory to inserting a proviso in this bill, the question whether counties in a State might feel assured that they were going to be protected by all the land that is turned over to the Federal Government and cut-over land, and that the Federal Government will repay to these counties a fair proportion of what would be the tax on this land if it remained in private ownership?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I can assure the gentleman that, so far as our committee is concerned, we shall be very glad indeed to give consideration to any data which the gentleman from California may submit.

But what I can not understand is that with all the advertised hearings of this select Senate committee and our hearings in the consideration of this bill that that data was not submitted to us or the select committee of the Senate at the time it held

hearings in the gentleman's own State. I will say this to the gentleman, however, that the committee is willing to give consideration to any data which will throw light or prove helpful on this subject.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Has the committee given consideration to the probable cost of the operation of this bill during a period of years?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. The bill authorizes an appropriation of \$2,700,000 as an annual appropriation. This has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That appropriation is not contained in the bill?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Only the authorization is there.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. In a hurried reading of the bill it occurs to me—and I imagine that is the intention of it—that \$100,000 is to be spent in furnishing seed and seed plants to private interests without compensation to the Government. Is that the meaning of the bill?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Would the gentleman mind stating, briefly, a reason as to why the Government should furnish these things free to private owners?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Suppose the Government has a tract of land with trees growing on it and there is a piece of cut-over land adjoining the Government land which the Government wants to use for the purpose of developing a watershed, growing trees, or something like that, is it not right that the Government should furnish the plants and the seed to accomplish that purpose? The State of New York is to-day furnishing almost 9,000,000 young trees for the people of the State to plant, and the State is doing that at anywhere from 50 cents to \$2.50 per thousand.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I was wondering whether this bill provided for an absolutely free gift or whether it provided for a sale at cost, such as the gentleman has indicated is done by the State of New York?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. It is contemplated that they shall be distributed at cost.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. That would suit me perfectly; but I would not like to see the Federal Government go into the business of furnishing tree plants without compensation. The gentleman states it is the plan to charge the cost of these things.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. Is there any opposition to the bill? If not, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I personally believe we should not delay this debate and in view of the further fact that extensive hearings were held on this bill, I shall not take much time in discussing it. At our hearings not a discordant note was heard and not a word of opposition or criticism. Everything was unanimous, and every person who appeared before the committee and every member of the committee has favored this bill. In all the correspondence I have had and in all the letters and telegrams I have received there has not been a word of objection to this bill. As far as I have been able to ascertain, the opinion throughout the entire country is uniform, unanimous, and urgently in favor of the passage of this bill. That being the case, Mr. Chairman, I see no reason for discussing it, debating it, or prolonging the discussion in any way.

I merely rise to give my most earnest and cordial indorsement of the bill, and hope it may be speedily passed. [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASWELL. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. I am very much interested in the bill and have been interested in this kind of legislation for many years. Section 3 of the bill deals with the question of taxation, which to me seems to be the greatest obstacle in the way of satisfactorily carrying out legislation of this character.

Is there any hope of the States generally taking a reasonable, far-sighted, and, I might say, statesmanlike view on this question of the taxation of land that is being reforested?

Mr. ASWELL. That question, I will say to the gentleman from Connecticut, was discussed quite fully in the committee, and the information the committee received was to the effect that the interest in taxation favorable to this sort of reforestation is rapidly increasing throughout the country, and that the effort of the bill to have a study made of the taxation laws of those States that are progressive, and laying that information before the other States will have a great influence in bringing all the other States into line and result in hastening the reforestation of the land.

Mr. TILSON. It would seem to me that would be the most useful kind of work to be done in connection with this bill, because without a wiser and more far-sighted taxing policy than that which now generally prevails it will be almost impossible to reforest our land.

Mr. ASWELL. That is as far as the Government can go in that direction.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASWELL. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. What States have reforestation laws?

Mr. ASWELL. Louisiana has the best in the world, as well as Massachusetts and New York.

Mr. HASTINGS. Those three?

Mr. ASWELL. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If the gentleman will permit, the hearings show that there are only 12 States in the Union which have not any kind of a reforestation law. Here are some of the States which do not have such a law: South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I was going to claim time in opposition to the bill, but the gentleman from Iowa promised to yield me five minutes. If there is any question about it, I claim an hour in opposition to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a matter of argument.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Iowa promised to yield me five minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the gentleman want it now?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I would like to have it now.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If the gentleman from Texas is going to run the Agricultural Committee bills when they are on the floor and shut out the members of the committee, like the chairman did a while ago, as far as I am concerned you can take this agricultural legislation and go with it. But I want to serve notice on you now that you have got to "tote" fairly with members on the Agricultural Committee representing this side in the consideration of its bills in this House.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman has had time.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I did not have any time at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is in charge of the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. The chairman is not supposed to go around and ask everybody about wanting time.

I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE].

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. I understand the gentleman from Iowa has an hour on this bill and is yielding his time. Now, there is an hour that can be used otherwise on the bill, is there not?

The CHAIRMAN. Only by some one who secures recognition who is opposed to the bill.

Mr. RAKER. I want to call the Chair's attention to the fact that it has been ruled at least two or three times that a man does not have to say he is opposed to the bill in order to use the two hours on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That situation has not arisen yet, but it is the opinion of the present occupant of the chair that in order to claim recognition on Calendar Wednesday it must appear that the person asking for recognition is opposed to the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to it, but I only want five minutes. That is all I want, and I want to get it one way or the other. [Laughter.]

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee yielded me 10 minutes and I only used 3, and I will yield it to either one of the gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield back his time?

Mr. ASWELL. To the control of the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back five minutes. The gentleman from Iowa has control of the time.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE].

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to use 10 minutes of time. I am going to proceed in a way similar to the gentleman from Louisiana.

I want to say in the beginning I do not think there is a bill on either calendar of this House, barring none, that is as important as this bill not only to the present generation but to the generations in this country to follow. [Applause.] I want to say to you gentlemen that after months of hearings by the Committee on Agriculture not only in this Congress but in the last Congress, after reading the report of the special committee of the Senate which went over the country and held hearings, as the gentleman from New York has stated, hearing all the interests of the country, I think it is a crime and a shame for this American Congress to neglect the reforestation of the lands of this country for the benefit of the generations yet unborn. [Applause.]

I am not going into the details of the bill now, but will do so under the five-minute rule. The bill is a cooperative system in connection with the States, starting like we started the good-roads proposition. There are only 12 States in the Union that do not have some kind of reforestation laws. I say it somewhat with shame that four years ago Kentucky, my State, repealed its reforestation laws, but the State saw its mistake and the legislature which adjourned a few days ago reenacted a reforestation law.

A startling statement made by the Chief Forester of the Agricultural Department shows that there are 60,000,000,000 feet of lumber that are taken from the domain of this country in a year, and of that 60,000,000,000 there are 7,000,000,000 feet that go up in flames and in ashes. The main purpose of this bill is that the appropriation carried in it is to protect the cut-over lands and the timbered lands from fire, and whenever you have complete protection of that kind you are then starting something that is constructive not only for the preservation of the timber that is merchantable to-day but for the cut-over lands of the country. You can not reforest a tract of land when it is burnt over every year. That is one thing that this bill proposes to accomplish.

The Weeks bill has been a great bill, and I think one of the unfortunate acts of recent Congresses has been cutting down that appropriation. That bill provided for the buying of land for the protection of watersheds and also for protecting the timberlands of the country. This Congress and the Congress before has cut that appropriation very materially. It used to be \$1,000,000 a year and they have cut it down to only \$400,000. That is the only national appropriation we have for the protection of the timbered and cut-over lands of this country. Let me show you what the States do under that bill even with the measly sum of \$400,000. The States of this Union have responded and have appropriated \$1,900,000, and the private owners of timbered lands have contributed \$1,000,000. In other words, we are spending and getting a protection costing a little over \$3,000,000 for the timbered and cut-over lands of this country with an appropriation of only \$400,000 out of the Federal Treasury. I submit to you that if the States of the Union are sufficiently interested to cover that appropriation practically 8 to 1, if you enact this law, which has an appropriation of \$2,700,000, saying to every State in the Union, including the 12 that have no reforestation laws, just as Uncle Sam says to them in the road law, "Every time you put down a dollar for the reforestation and protection of your timbered lands Uncle Sam will put down a dollar," the result will be astounding. With the expenditure of this measly sum of \$400,000, which is now available, the hearings show they are protecting, as best they can, 160,000,000 acres of forest land in this country, and yet this Congress has neglected for all these years to enter upon a constructive policy which means the reforestation of the cut-over lands of millions of acres and to protect the virgin forests from devastation by fire and other causes.

Another provision is to encourage the reforestation of the wood lots throughout the country. These timbered lands are so far from the center of population that the freight rates on the timber after it is sawed is practically more than the timber is worth when it is cut down.

We should reforest these timber lots throughout the country and call the attention of the farmers to the importance of it.

I believe if you will read this bill you will agree with me it is a constructive bill and will agree that it will do more for the reforestation of the cut-over lands of this country than

any other bill that has ever been before the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. In reading section 4 of this bill it looks to me as though the bill contemplates that the Federal Government will furnish tree seed and plants to private parties free of charge. I am wondering if that is a wise thing to do.

Mr. KINCHELOE. That question came up in the committee, and if the gentleman will notice the committee amendment he will see that it only applies principally to windbreaks, shelter belts, and farm wood lots.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. It goes ahead and adds different items, and it seems we are going far away to put the Federal Government into the business of furnishing tree plants to the big lumber interests of the Nation.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I do not think it contemplates that.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. And I will not be a party to it if I am the last Member on the floor of the House.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The gentleman has that privilege, but it does not contemplate that; it is to encourage the farmer who owns the small wood lot or windbreak in going ahead and protecting his wood lot—and there are thousands of them—and encouraging them to the extent of furnishing plants and seeds in order to keep it intact.

Mr. MOREHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOREHEAD. I am seeking information. Is it not a fact that a large percentage of these lands is now in the hands of large interests who acquired title without paying the Government anything, and if we reforest these lands will we not again be making them a present in a short time?

Mr. KINCHELOE. This is to be done in cooperation with State legislation. The State legislature has got to pass laws to be entitled to participate in the Federal fund, and that will be aided by private contributions which has amounted to over a million dollars for the measly sum of \$400,000.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. And may I point out that the States are not losing anything, even taking the statement of the gentleman as absolutely true. The moment you grow trees upon lands you increase the taxable income of the State.

Mr. MOREHEAD. I was referring to the large tracts of land, for instance on the Pacific coast, where I find there is a disposition of the State to charge a tax on stumps and otherwise to increase the taxes rather than to encourage reforestation.

Mr. KINCHELOE. That will be a question for each State to work out just as it is under the Federal road act.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. I want to call attention to the fact that it takes a tree longer to grow into maturity than the life of a man and in order to encourage the use of these lands even in private ownership that are more feasible for producing timber than for agricultural purposes it is necessary for the Government to act not only now but through the lifetime of many men and look forward to encouraging the men who own land privately and keep the growing timber in order that future generations may be supplied with timber.

Mr. KINCHELOE. To show the progress that has been made with what little legislation Congress has enacted, take the Weeks law. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] is a member of that commission, and that commission has bought with the appropriations heretofore made by Congress amounting to 2,225,000 acres of land. At the hearings before the Agricultural Committee in the last session of Congress when we had the Snell bill before us I think the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] testified that that land that they have bought under the provisions of the Weeks bill is worth from 50 to 100 per cent more than the Federal Government paid for it. Why? Because they have been protecting it, keeping fires away from it, and therefore it has been reforested to such an extent that it has been a wonderful success.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WATKINS. In the gentleman's time I want to submit one statement. One of the objects of the bill that will justify every Member of the House voting for it is best stated by the Department of Agriculture, as follows:

The average forest-fire damage in Oregon and Washington for the five-year period amounts to \$1,580,492, of which \$1,098,060 was for timber destroyed; in 1922 it amounted to \$3,081,551, of which

\$1,660,669 was the value of timber damaged and destroyed. For Oregon only the average amount of damage for a five-year period is \$544,691—\$443,074 for timber alone—while for 1922 the total loss due to forest fires was \$480,891, of which \$228,151 was timber destroyed.

I say that fire prevention alone would justify the passage of this bill.

Mr. KINCHELOE. That is the major thing in the bill. I have no more interest in the bill than you have, but it is a national problem and I do not believe there is a more important bill on the calendar of this House than is this, and it ought to be passed at the earliest possible moment. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I am. Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize to my distinguished friend from Kentucky for butting into his Agricultural Committee's bill. I know how he feels about it; he feels that all the balance of us are outsiders and have no business fooling with his bill.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If the gentleman wants my opinion, I think he sometimes opposes a bill in order to display his oratory.

Mr. BLANTON. I am apologizing to my friend now for daring to oppose it. I am not out of humor about it, and I am sorry that that idea possesses the gentleman.

There is a bad governmental policy in this bill that I am going to convince my friend of, and I believe others here will be convinced of it. I am going to use just a few minutes in doing it, if I am not interrupted. If the gentleman had not pushed me to it, I was going to get only five minutes from the chairman of the committee, but whenever it is intimated that the balance of us have no right to the floor because it is a bill from the Agricultural Committee, then I am going to resort to the rules of the House to obtain my rights.

If the Ways and Means Committee brings in a bad bill, I reserve the right to fight it, and that is the biggest committee in the House. If the Committee on Appropriations, the next largest one, brings in a bill that I think is bad, I shall fight it without hesitation. No committee in this House can get so big that when it brings in a bill I think is bad I shall be prevented from fighting it.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall get down to the bill.

That is a good point of order. My friend is learning the rules. I sustain his point of order. [Laughter.] Let me show you the first bad feature in the bill. We are creating an annual appropriation and revolving fund for all time to eternity in this bill. If you read section 3, you will see that it provides that every year from now on, and that is from now to eternity, annually, we shall authorize an appropriation of \$2,500,000, to be used by this Secretary. That is to be an annual appropriation of \$2,500,000, and any part unexpended becomes a revolving fund.

Mr. ALMON. Does the gentleman mean that it is revolving, or does it all go out?

Mr. BLANTON. If it is not all spent it is still in his hands, with \$2,500,000 more every year.

Mr. ALMON. Then it will not revolve.

Mr. BLANTON. If there is any left, it revolves. Read section 4, and you will find there is another annual appropriation provided there of \$100,000 each year for the Secretary to use every year from now until our grandchildren grow gray, for the purpose of furnishing forest seeds, and so forth. Then read section 5 of the bill, and you will find another annual appropriation authorized there of \$100,000 for the Secretary of Agriculture every year from now to eternity, which he may lend to the farmers in order that they may build windbreaks, and so forth. I am not in favor of any such system of thus authorizing annual appropriations for all time to come. I am in favor of this bill, and I mean by that I am in favor of the main fundamental policy of the bill. However, I am not in favor of these lump sum annual appropriations that are provided for in the bill which shall extend beyond our term of office from now to eternity. When I voted for the good-roads proposition I made up my mind then that that was the last of the kind that I was going to vote for. I have seen this revolving fund of over \$100,000,000 supplemented by additional appropriations annually, kept in the hands of the Shipping Board, and wasted every year extravagantly, and I made up my mind that I would not vote for another piece of legislation of that kind. You can do it, if you wish.

I regret to make my distinguished friend from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] mad by butting into his bill. I hate to make

it appear to my other colleagues here, as it does to him, that it is a pleasure to get up here and speak, when it is an effort and hard work. I do not know how much longer I am going to last. I have seen about 40 of my colleagues die here, and I may be the next one, but I would die in a good cause, and my friend from Kentucky may be sorry some day that he intimated that the hard work I do is to get notoriety. It is for the benefit of my country that I do this hard work.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. In view of the fact that less than one-third of our virgin timber remains, and in view further of the fact that in one State, my own, we lose more in dollars than this whole bill provides, does not the gentleman think it is about time we did something to prevent fire alone, eliminating all of the other provisions?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not objecting to your doing anything, if you strike out the word "annually" in sections 3, 4, and 5.

Mr. WATKINS. And the gentleman will not say another word about it?

Mr. BLANTON. No; not another word.

Mr. WATKINS. And will vote for the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. There are three places in the bill where you should strike out the word "annually." It should be struck out in section 3 and out of section 4 and out of section 5. If you do that, I will vote for your bill.

Mr. WATKINS. I know; but fire occurs every year.

Mr. BLANTON. Will there not be a Congress here next year? Does the gentleman think that this is the last Congress we are going to have?

Mr. WATKINS. Some people think it may be the last one that we will be Members of.

Mr. BLANTON. If I live, it will not be the last one that I am a Member of, I promise the gentleman, for my constituents at home are backing my work here. We will be back here next year and the year after next. There will be a Congress here as long as the Republic lasts. Why do we not let the succeeding Congress attend to its business in the future? "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Does not the gentleman think it would be worth a good deal if we could avoid going through with this thing every year? If it is a good thing to do it one year, it ought to be for the next and the next. Let us conserve the forests, and let the gentleman conserve his health. Just a minute ago I heard the prediction that the gentleman could not possibly hold up very long under the strain under which he is putting himself here. We do not want to lose him. Let us save the forests and save the gentleman as well.

Mr. BLANTON. I will tell the gentleman how I am able to keep up. When we get through here this evening the gentleman will probably go to a reception or a dance—

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Oh, now—

Mr. BLANTON. For a rare change, I am going to take a nice drive over here in Maryland to-night and in that way get new blood in my veins.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Do I understand the gentleman is going to follow the gentleman from Maryland over there?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am going to follow our distinguished friend from Florida for a few hours.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The gentleman does not know that the gentleman from Washington goes to a fox chase oftener than he does to a dance. He does not happen to be in the same group mentioned by the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. STEPHENS. Does not the gentleman think we ought to have forest conservation in order that we can go on a fox hunt?

Mr. BLANTON. That is one good thing at least about the bill, that it gives cover for foxes so that we may have a chase two or three times a year. I am not going to take up any more of your time, but, in conclusion, I want to say this: That if you strike out that word "annually" Congress is going to be in session and we can provide these funds every year if Congress sees fit, but we should not make this an annual fund.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman read in the language of paragraph 4, for instance, that we are to make an annual appropriation for all time?

Mr. BLANTON. It says "annually."

Mr. TILSON. We authorize the appropriation to be made annually, but the appropriation will have to be made every year.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me ask the gentleman this, because he is one of the strong men of this House—

Mr. TILSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. If we pass a legislative bill authorizing the Appropriations Committee to make an appropriation, does the gentleman from Connecticut believe that committee will not do its duty?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; but if hereafter we do not think it should be made we do not have to appropriate; we can simply turn it down.

Mr. BLANTON. It has never been turned down.

Mr. TILSON. Let us assume—

Mr. BLANTON. But Congress every year, when we have authorized it in a legislative bill, puts the appropriation in the appropriation bill.

Mr. TILSON. But the gentleman admits we can stop any year if we think it is not wise.

Mr. BLANTON. We can not stop without repealing the legislative act.

Mr. TILSON. If we do not think we should appropriate for that purpose, we can fail to appropriate any year and stop it.

Mr. BLANTON. The Appropriations Committee always obeys legislative mandate. The gentleman is getting technical now.

Mr. TILSON. I am not technical, but I am stating the fact.

Mr. BLANTON. This bill is the legislative mandate to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. RUBEY. Is it the gentleman's opinion that we ought to pass this bill every year?

Mr. BLANTON. It is my opinion when the Forest Service needs money we ought to do with it like we do with the War Department, with the Navy Department, with the Post Office Department, the Treasury Department, the Commerce Department, and every department of the Government—give them what they need every year. When we are providing for them we can provide for the Forest Service just as well.

Mr. RUBEY. If the gentleman will yield further, you can not give that which is not authorized by law. Here we are authorizing by law, and it comes up to this body annually to give the money if we want to do so.

Mr. BLANTON. I know it; but I do not like that kind of legislation, and I am going to vote against it. I think it is one of the kind of measures upon which we ought to go on record. I am not going to ask for a roll call this evening with some of our friends absent, but I am going to try to get the chairman not to have any vote on this bill this evening, because it is one bill that we ought to have a record vote on as to whether or not we shall adopt this kind of policy.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. I understood the gentleman made the remark that he did not like this kind of legislation. Is there any legislation that comes before this House that the gentleman likes?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. I have several good bills here I introduced myself, and I hope the gentleman will vote for them. [Laughter.] I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], and the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, there are various viewpoints on this subject. The committee is trying to do a splendid thing. First, it has been suggested that a great deal of forest land has been destroyed by fire. Of course my distinguished friend from Oregon [Mr. WATKINS] knows that the authorization for appropriations for fire protection now is unlimited, so that we can appropriate any amount of money desired for protection of the forests against fire. That question is not involved in this bill, because we have the legislation now. All we need is the money and the men.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TINCHER. There is not any organization for the matching of dollars by the State for ours?

Mr. RAKER. No. I am talking about the general appropriation.

There are so many things for one to attend to that one can not attend to them all, but I think one of the fundamental things that ought to be done by this Congress, and should have been done years ago, is to pass a law requiring private individuals to so cut the timber on their lands as not to absolutely destroy it as well as destroy the watersheds of our country. It is a matter of keeping up stream flow and keeping up navigation, and there is not the slightest doubt in my mind but

that it is constitutional and ought to be on the statute books. Many private individuals who now own timber are cutting it in accordance with the general rules and regulations of the Forest Service. This I have observed throughout the West in the last year.

Three years ago I spent practically two months in the forests of California and what little there is left of them in Nevada and in Washington and Oregon, studying this subject. Now there is involved in this bill a feature that is not provided for; I guess it can be done in another bill, though I wish the committee would not object to it going in this bill.

The committee could act on it now. There is a great deal of cut-over land in the West in the public-land States that is owned by private individuals. They are paying taxes on it, and they are hardly getting enough return to pay the taxes. They are renting it for grazing purposes, barely receiving enough to pay the taxes assessed thereon. They are anxious, of course, to be relieved of this land and the burden. Now, what we ought to do and what is the fair thing to do is to keep the timber on the land, not for reservations in the way of parks, for military, or other functions of that kind, but to keep it as a proprietary owner would keep it for the benefit of his family, which in this case consists of 110,000,000 people in the United States. We are maintaining a greater part of the civil government in keeping these forests in shape and in exercising police control of the country in which the land is situated. The Government is doing that now from receipts, not from the contributions of the general public, but by money earned right on the ground, which we police and maintain for the Government, and we return to the States a certain amount for roads and some money for school purposes.

What the people are anxious about and desirous of is to obtain for the Federal Government this cut-over land, which to a great extent we are policing and controlling now, where we are maintaining a fire brigade to protect it, because we protect a tract of Government land over here, and another one over here, and a privately owned piece of land may lie in between, and we have got to watch that; so that our people are paying out the money. I have been hoping to get the data together so that I could place before the committee the results of the studies and investigations I have made on the subject, and the last letter I received on this subject was from the officer in charge of public lands in the State of Louisiana.

Our people are in favor of reforestation projects and of putting the land back where it ought to be; but we feel, when the land is owned by the Government, not for the use of the people of my country or my State or of adjoining States but for the people of America, just as in the case of a private tax holding, that when it is proposed to take over privately owned land, where this cut-over land is returned to the Government—and it ought to be, because we can now get it cheaply—the Government, out of the General Treasury of the United States, ought to pay approximately what the individual owner would pay in taxes. For instance, here is a tract of land owned by private individuals and it is assessed at a certain value; here is a tract of land lying side by side and identically the same, owned by the Federal Government and held for all the people, not for governmental use but for all the people's use; the Government ought to return to the county the same proportion of taxes as the private individual pays by virtue of taxation, so that we may maintain our roads, our schools, our civil government, and pay our expenses.

I was in hopes that when this legislation came up—upon which this committee was acting last year and took testimony—they would be able to consider this. I have collated the testimony of the men who appeared before the committee and I find that practically every one testified that when the Government obtained the title to the land, the Government, out of the Federal Treasury, should reimburse the county in proportion and at practically the same rate as the private individual pays taxes to the county for the land he owns. Now, is not that fair, gentlemen?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. May I have three minutes more?

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. RAKER. That will then put the Forest Service where it should have been all the time and that would put the cut-over land in the class where it belongs.

I want to call the committee's attention to this fact: But very little land in the Western States is like the land in the Eastern States. You can not use the land for agricultural purposes. Cut over once and it is barren, unless it is taken care of. Even

in my short time I have seen thousands and tens of thousands of acres of land with virgin timber on it; the timber was cut off, and to-day the land is as barren as this floor.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Who are the private owners to whom the gentleman refers?

Mr. RAKER. There are many, scattered over the Western States.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Are they timber companies which have denuded this land?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; that is right.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. And now you want the Government to buy that land of them and pay the taxes on it, do you?

Mr. RAKER. What do you do in this bill?

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I am just asking the gentleman.

Mr. RAKER. Is not that just exactly what is in this bill? Is not that so, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. The chairman answers yes. That is in this bill, unlimited in acreage and amount of land. That is right, is it not, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HAUGEN. We have been purchasing land for the last 10 or 12 years.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I am interested in that point. Just what objection has the gentleman to allowing the ownership of this land to remain where it is vested and let them pay the taxes to build your roads and schools?

Mr. RAKER. What I want to say to the gentleman is this: I have seen land within the last 15 years which has been cut over and I have seen a growth of new timber; I have seen in 40 years in California trees from 2 to 3 feet in diameter which have grown up after the land was cut over, but the land was taken care of. There are tens of thousands of acres of pine land which have been cut over; the land has been properly cared for; the fire has been kept out, and in 40 or 100 years there will be a growth of timber that will be of great commercial value and of untold value to the people of the United States.

What I am suggesting is that this privately owned land, this cut-over land, should be turned over to the Government, as we can get it for a small price, and the people of America can afford to hold that land and have it reforested, as it ought to be. But the Federal Government, out of the General Treasury, ought to return to the county in which the land is held by the Federal Government for this purpose a reasonable amount of money in order to complete the amount of money it would have received had the land remained in private ownership for taxation.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The provision to which the gentleman refers, requiring the Federal Government to pay taxes on the land after it acquires it, is not in the bill.

Mr. RAKER. That is the trouble with it.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It is not in the bill, but the gentleman wants it in the bill.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; and I have a bill pending for that purpose. I say that is what ought to be in it and the Government ought to pay this proportion to the county. The Federal Government owns the lands, but the Federal Government is not holding it for park purposes or for military purposes. It is holding it for the benefit of the American people and the expense of it ought to come out of the Treasury of the United States.

I am for this kind of legislation, but I do hope the committee will permit the adoption of the amendment I have suggested before the bill is finally passed.

The bill I refer to was introduced by me on December 5, 1923, and is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 148) to provide compensation in lieu of taxes for the several States with respect to certain lands of the United States within the borders of said States, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That when used in this act, unless the context indicates otherwise, the term "lands of the United States" means lands set apart, reserved, or withdrawn under the provisions of section 24 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to repeal timber culture laws, and for other purposes," and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto.

The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. That the United States Government hereby assumes, subject to the conditions of this act or any subsequent act of Congress, the payment to the several States of sums of money equivalent to the amounts which such States would receive from the taxation of said

lands of the United States within their respective borders if such lands were owned by individuals.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the passage of this act and annually thereafter, at such time of the year as the legislature of the State may designate, send a statement to the governor, or such other officer as the legislature may designate, of every State in which such lands are located, describing the location, size, and character of all lands of the United States within the border of such State, together with such information respecting such lands as he may possess which may be useful in properly determining their value.

SEC. 4. That no payments shall be made to any State under the provisions of this act until such State has, with respect to the lands of the United States in question, acting through its officers and agents duly authorized therefor—

(1) Properly assessed such lands of the United States at a rate no higher than that at which other similar lands within such State are assessed.

(2) Applied to such assessed valuation a factor no higher than the tax rate applied to the assessed value of other similar lands within such State.

(3) Secured in this manner, a figure from which shall be deducted any allowances made by such State to its taxpayers in similar cases for prompt payment of taxes or for any other reason.

(4) Certified the figures so reached with respect to each piece of such lands of the United States, accompanied by statements as to the methods employed in arriving at such figures, to the Secretary.

(5) Furnished the Secretary with such further information as he may request respecting the methods employed in valuing and assessing such lands of the United States and in assessing and taxing other similar lands within the State.

(6) Complied with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe for carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary shall receive and examine the figures submitted by the States under the provisions of section 4. In the event that any State shall submit figures with respect to any lands of the United States, based (1) on a higher valuation than the Secretary believes to be the actual value of such lands, or (2) on a higher rate of assessment or of taxation than he believes is employed in the case of other similar lands within such State, or (3) in whole or in part on any other improper consideration, he shall so revise and reduce such figures as to allow and compensate for such error or miscalculation. Such revised and reduced figures shall be final and conclusive when so determined by the Secretary, except that he may, in his discretion, permit any State affected by such revision or reduction to offer such evidence and argument respecting the matters in question as he may deem advisable, after which the Secretary may change his determination in such manner as he shall deem proper.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury annually and as promptly as practicable with respect to every State receiving benefits hereunder the amounts to which such State is entitled under the provisions of this act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon cause such amounts to be paid to the designated officers of the States indicated. Whenever the Secretary shall determine that any State has, for any reason, been paid more than the amounts to which it is entitled under the provisions of this act, he shall deduct such overpayments from the next amounts certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to such State.

SEC. 7. That no payments shall be made to any State, under the provisions of this act, with respect to any such lands of the United States which do not remain such for the entire tax year of the State in which they are located, nor with respect to any such lands of the United States which the State might lawfully tax by reason of the fact that the beneficial interest in such lands is not vested in the United States.

SEC. 8. That the Secretary shall have power to prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time to make the payments required by this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, sections 1 and 2 of this bill relate to fire prevention and provide a system of cooperation between the Federal Government and the several States, and authorizes a sufficient appropriation therefor. Of course, I think that is a legitimate function of the Federal Government. We are doing that now. Protection of private property by public agency from fire destruction is a proper governmental function, and I am in sympathy with it.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the gentleman say we are now preventing fires and protecting the timbered lands, and doing that now?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. On forest reserves we are doing a great deal of it. We have employees on these great forest reserves in the West, who are there for this very express purpose.

Mr. WATKINS. We are not preventing fires. We may be authorized to do it, but we are not doing it.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I say we are doing the best we can, with the number of men employed for that purpose.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there for a question?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Out in the western country last year airplanes flew over the national forests and were paid by the Federal Government to prevent fires and put them out.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. It was done just one summer to try it out by the War Department. Last summer it was not done and millions of dollars of property was destroyed and is destroyed every year, and we are not preventing forest fires.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. If the gentleman will permit, I, of course, did not mean to say that we were doing as much along that line as we should do, and the gentleman, no doubt, understood me to say that I favored that part of the bill now before us which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make greater efforts in this line by means of cooperation with the several States.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there just for another question?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes; I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. RAKER. The reason we did not protect them last year—and the western people were in favor of it—was because there was not the money appropriated for that purpose which was authorized and could have been appropriated if they had wanted to appropriate it.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, the administration bought garden seed and sent them out, but would not take half of that sum and help to protect the forests of the West?

Mr. RAKER. No; they even denied us garden seed last year.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Now, if the gentlemen will permit me to use a little of my time—and I have been glad to yield to both of them—it was upon the subject of free distribution of seeds and plants—not garden seed, but forest seeds and plants—that I wanted to address myself. Section 4 of this bill reads as follows:

That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to cooperate with the various States in the procurement, production, and distribution of forest-tree seeds and plants for the purpose of establishing forests, windbreaks, shelter belts, and farm wood lots upon denuded or nonforested lands within such cooperating States—

And so forth.

Now, mind you, there is no provision in the bill that confines this Government's activity to public lands. It authorizes an appropriation of \$100,000 annually to be spent by the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the several States in distributing these tree seeds and tree plants. Upon that section I made an inquiry of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLARKE], who has given a great deal of consideration to this subject, and the gentleman says that his own State of New York has a system of distributing these tree plants at cost to those who desire to use them. That is all right. I would like to see the Federal Government do the same thing toward increasing our forest resources, but there is not a thing in the world in this section to prevent, and, in fact, it looks to me like the only purpose of it is to authorize the Secretary to make a free distribution of these tree seeds and these tree plants.

I can very well see how these large lumber companies who own these great acres of cut-over lands—I can readily see how they would like for the Federal Government to furnish them free of charge with tree plants and tree seeds. That would be fine for them but not a fair deal for the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. In the first place there is only \$100,000 authorized and that is spread out over many States. Taking the gentleman's own statement and the gentleman's own theory, does not the gentleman think it is better for the Government to tell a man who has, we will say, 1,000 acres of cut-over land, "If you will only take these young trees and plant them, we will be glad to donate them to you"? Do you not think it is better to encourage that private owner than it is to allow

those lands to be absolutely nothing but waste? Do you not think that is better as a matter of public policy?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman grant me about three more minutes and then I will conclude. I want to state my views a little more completely.

Mr. ASWELL. May I ask the gentleman just one question?

Mr. HAUGEN. The time is very limited, but I will yield to the gentleman three more minutes.

Mr. ASWELL. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he had noted that it would be impossible for the Federal Government to do that unless it had the cooperation of the State?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Oh, the language so states. Of course the State government would have to provide a fund for the free distribution of these tree seeds and tree plants before the Federal Government would be called upon to pay its part. I can see how the Federal Government might engage in many kinds of philanthropy, various sorts of gratuities, which would be helpful to private interests, but are we to continue to launch out upon these so-called cooperative methods which act as a constant drain upon the Public Treasury and is one reason why taxes are so high? Oh, yes; the Federal Government can give away money in lots of different ways, but in the end the people pay the bills.

I am going to offer an amendment to this section which will provide that no forest trees or plants shall be distributed under the provisions of this act to private interests for less than the cost thereof, and the receipts therefrom shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. LEAVITT. If you were going to invest money that would bring you no return for a period of 60 or 80 years, would you consider it a good personal investment, although it might be a good investment for your heirs?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I am not here to pass upon whether the cut-over lands are good investments or bad investments. We have in our State cut-over lands which produce timber in a much less time than 60 or 80 years, and I know very well that we have owners of these large areas who would like mighty well to have the Federal Government come in and say, "We will reforest your lands for you; we will furnish the tree plants and the tree seeds out of the Treasury of the United States."

Gentlemen, we have too many things of this kind already living out of the Public Treasury. We have many other calls upon us that we might answer, too, if we are to answer them at the expense of the taxpayer; but I think we will have done enough in the matter of tree-seed distribution and tree-plant distribution if the Federal Government defrays the administrative expenses and furnishes the seed and plants at cost. We passed a bill yesterday to lend the farmers in the State of New Mexico \$1,000,000 for the purchase of seeds. Their need was very great, but we did not intend to make a donation. We provided to loan them the money, and we are to take a first lien upon their crops for reimbursement.

I am going to offer an amendment to this bill, and I hope you, gentlemen will support it, which will say to the Secretary of Agriculture "You shall get the cost of the seed and the plants when you distribute them and shall cover the receipts therefrom into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to consume any of the time so kindly allotted to me by the chairman of our committee. I indorse this bill, but I shall not prolong the time of the debate. The committee has given it careful consideration, and, as has been said by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL], men have appeared before our committee from every part of the Union urging its passage. The Committee on Agriculture is unanimous in its report. We have received communications from all over the country urging this legislation. There is no opposition to it from any source. I simply say I hope the bill will be passed as speedily as possible.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JEFFERS].

Mr. JEFFERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to use these two minutes to ask a question of the author of the bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLARKE]. As I understand it, sec-

tion 9 of the bill H. R. 4830 provides that in the case of a Government-owned military reservation the forests within such a reservation may be conserved and preserved by establishing such a reservation as a national forest, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture under such rules and regulations and in accordance with such general plan as may be jointly approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of War, to provide for the use and occupation of such lands and for the sale of products from such lands, but remaining subject to the unhampered use of the War Department for military purposes. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. That is all true. There are 600,000 acres in military reservations better adapted to growing trees, and the Secretary of War is pleased with this provision.

Mr. JEFFERS. I simply wanted to get that straight, as I have a bill (H. R. 33), as the gentleman knows, to establish the McClellan National Forest in the State of Alabama, which already has the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of War, and I wanted to be sure that it will be provided for in this general bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor. I will work for it and vote for it. As my good colleague, Doctor ASWELL, has said, the people of Louisiana are for it, and inferentially and facetiously, therefore, I say the people of the country ought to be for it. Many prominent men and women from every part of Louisiana have written me on the great importance of this bill and asking me to vote for it. I rise, Mr. Chairman, not only to announce this attitude on the part of patriotic Louisianians who are interested in all of our great natural and national resources and who believe that by their care the general welfare may be best promoted, but also for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing a letter I received from Mr. Augustus B. Harris, president of the New Orleans Branch of the Federal Employees Union, and a copy of a letter he has written to Mr. MARTIN B. MADDEN, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

In his letter to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations Mr. Harris has so clearly and forcefully and yet conservatively, eloquently, and yet modestly and patriotically expressed the case of the customs employees at New Orleans that any attempt at elaboration on my part would be a supererogation. It might not be amiss for me to say, however, that never have I seen a case so convincingly set forth alleging and evidencing discrimination against himself and associates without even unconsciously showing a justifiable bitterness of spirit, so sure is he apparently that justice will be done by the American Congress in a case where justice cries out, and will insistently cry out, for a redress of a grievance suffered and patiently endured by a large number of our countrymen. Such a letter is really a testimonial to the unflinching confidence that Americans have in their Government.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,  
New Orleans, La., April 14, 1924.

MY DEAR MR. O'CONNOR: I am inclosing a copy of a letter which I have to-day sent your good friend Mr. MADDEN.

After giving this matter much thought I concluded that it was only fair to you gentlemen who have worked so hard and so persistently in our cause to let the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations know that there was substantial basis for the action you have taken in our behalf.

Sincerely yours,

AUGUSTUS B. HARRIS.

APRIL 14, 1924.

HON. MARTIN B. MADDEN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of a letter from our esteemed friend, Hon. JAMES O'CONNOR, in which he informs me of the failure of the conference committee to agree to Senate amendment to the Treasury Department appropriation which sought to add \$2,500,000 to provide increases in compensation for customs employees. In conveying this information to me Mr. O'CONNOR quotes from your splendid and candid expression on this subject appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of

the 13th ultimo, and which, since it states the intention of your committee to support an appropriation which shall put all departments on a parity by July 1, gives us much encouragement.

I am presuming to address you on this subject that you may more fully understand why our Representatives in Congress seem so persistent and so anxious to secure an appropriation which shall enable the Treasury Department to wipe out a discrimination against the great port of New Orleans, which has been handed down through successive administrations and which Assistant Secretary McKenzie Moss stated at a hearing before the Senate committee having the Treasury appropriation in charge that he was unable to understand.

While desirous of taking as little of your time as possible on a matter which concerns, however vitally, our port alone, I feel that you can have a better understanding of our plea if the salient facts are before you. For your information I invite your attention to the standing of the six leading ports other than New York for the fiscal year 1923:

Port	Collections	Cost	Employees	Average annual salary	Above New Orleans
Boston.....	\$67,485,000.00	\$0.0199	551	\$1,504.39	\$289.63
Philadelphia.....	52,304,878.79	.01173	396	1,470.33	253.57
New Orleans.....	25,212,106.32	.015	302	1,214.76	-----
Chicago.....	13,756,683.87	.02274	194	1,498.71	283.95
San Francisco.....	10,854,115.42	.0524	351	1,499.24	284.48
Baltimore.....	10,158,725.38	.030535	300	1,476.00	261.24

It will be seen from the above statement that at New Orleans the volume of business is greater, and the cost of handling it about one-fourth of the cost at San Francisco, yet here the average annual salary is \$284.48 less. At Baltimore the cost of collection is 100 per cent more, and yet there the average annual salary is \$261.24 higher. At Boston the cost is practically the same as here, yet the average salary there is \$289.63 greater than here.

As you are probably aware, the Treasury Department from time to time sends commissions of its very best special agents to check up the various ports and to make such suggestions and recommendations as these officers believe to be for the best interests of the service. Recently such a commission spent several months going over the port of New Orleans. They conducted their investigation and study along lines laid down by the office of the Secretary. I cite from their report to question No. 50, which was as follows:

"Considering the character of the work performed by the several employees, and their efficiency, is the salary in any instance excessive, and more than is usually paid for similar services at other ports, or is the salary in any case deficient?"

"Their answer was: In our opinion, there are no excessive salaries paid at this port; in fact, the salaries are below those paid at other ports of equal importance. As practically all of the salaries from special deputy collector to messenger are less than are paid to employees performing the same or similar service at other ports, we recommend that the department consider the advisability of a general readjustment of salaries in the customs service at New Orleans with a view to placing the employees at this port on a more equitable basis."

Their report was submitted to the collector of customs by the Treasury Department, and criticism invited. In commenting upon the commission's reply to question No. 50, the collector stated as follows:

"I have long been of the opinion that the salaries paid at this port are below those paid at other ports for similar work. The statement of the special agents that 'practically all of the salaries from special deputy collector to messenger are less than are paid the employees performing the same or similar service at other ports' is a confirmation of my opinion by those who know. It is evident, therefore, that this port has been discriminated against. The cause of this discrimination and its correction appear to be matters for the consideration of the department."

Perhaps, like we of the customs service in New Orleans, you will find it difficult to understand this condition. I shall not seek to offer an explanation, for, frankly, the task is beyond me. When it is borne in mind that customs employees at this port are required to pass the same entrance examinations, and, in the discharge of their duties, use the same forms, enforce the same regulations based upon the same statutes, work the same number of hours, and, in every other particular, meet all customs requirements as do the employees at the other major ports, it seems that we are the same in every respect except in the matter of compensation. Of course, nothing can be done in this matter unless sufficient funds are provided. While we concede that customs employees throughout the United States have not been given increases sufficient to meet the increased cost of living, we have no hesitancy in saying that the condition of the customs employee at the great port of New Orleans is most appealing.

I take this opportunity of thanking you for your material and sustained interest in the welfare of Federal employees throughout the Nation. It is really refreshing to know that, in the midst of the whirl and turmoil of the present session, and notwithstanding the ever-increasing demands from all quarters upon the good will of the gentlemen of the Congress, there are those who realize that the toiler in the Federal service is entitled to some consideration. We are grateful indeed for your splendid efforts in our behalf, and I am sure that I voice the sentiment of our entire local corps in giving this expression of our deep gratitude.

Sincerely yours,

AUGUSTUS B. HARRIS, *President.*

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT].

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it would hardly seem necessary to say anything more than has been said on this question, for we are practically in unanimous agreement. Personally I believe that with one exception there is no more important bill that has been presented to the House this session. I believe the measure should be passed without amendment, preferably, and if any amendments are determined upon they should not in any way interfere with the purpose of the bill. I say this because for 11 years I was engaged in the forestry work, and I know the problems that are helped toward the solution by this bill as a matter of first-hand experience.

Several questions have been raised here that are easy to answer. Something has been said about the loss of taxation, the depriving of communities of returns as a result of areas of cut-over lands coming into the possession of the United States. We must balance that against two things: One is that this bill provides that studies shall be made to bring about a constructive taxation program within the different States which will meet problems of this kind, and the other is that those of us who know States that years ago were covered with fine stands of timber, and have seen with the denuding of those timberlands the passing away of one prosperous community after another which had depended on forest products for prosperity, or who have seen agricultural communities practically ruined along the foothills, through the washing down of silt out of the hills and the mountains, and by floods which followed the cutting and burning of the forests from the slopes of the hills, will recognize that the bringing back again to timber production of much of the cut-over land of this country will restore to prosperity many communities of this sort, agricultural communities, and communities supported by the manufacture of forest products. There would, therefore, be restored within a comparatively short period of years so much taxable property that all the loss of taxes sustained for the time being, while the forest lands were being again developed, would be much more than made up and under a permanent policy of protection. But it is also entirely possible to work out a plan that will return continually to the different counties and States a fair payment of funds from the holding of these lands as a matter of equity, or from handling of forest and forage products which will be continually growing upon them.

But in this connection we must keep in mind that one reason why there are great denuded areas of forest lands in this country is that incorrect systems of taxation have been followed in many different States. Systems of taxation have been followed which have forced timber owners to cut their timber, sometimes even in advance of a proper market, because they could not afford to hold it and pay taxes year after year on property that was not yielding anything. We have thus helped to bring about this unfortunate situation.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. BOX. Is it contemplated that the Federal Government shall interfere to the extent of restraining the local authorities in the exercise of their function to levy taxes?

Mr. LEAVITT. No, indeed. This measure simply carries a provision that will allow a study, in conjunction with the States, of proper taxation systems to help obviate these conditions causing the forced cutting over of timberlands.

Mr. BOX. Is it not true that many of these lands are capable of cultivation and could make homes for productive citizens—the lands being now held by large land companies for speculative purposes—and that the country would benefit as much by the development of those lands as from their remaining in forests?

Mr. LEAVITT. Undoubtedly so; and lands of that kind, as I understand it, do not come within the scope of this bill. We simply aim to restore timber to lands more suitable for the

production of timber than for agricultural purposes. Moreover, in connection with the carrying on of our agriculture, we must keep in mind that the conservation of a timber cover at the heads of streams is essential to the preservation of a steady stream flow, necessary for irrigation, necessary for domestic purposes, for water power, and for navigation. The forest growth is so essential to the preservation of a country that if you will follow the history of different nations in their rise and fall, you will observe the interesting fact that they have flourished when their natural resources, largely timber, were in their most productive state, and that they began to fall as the forests disappeared from the hills. With the loss of timber went the productivity of the land, and there was a falling off of industries and a depletion of population, leaving desolate great areas which in the past had supported large communities.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I agree with the gentleman as to the injurious effect of the cutting of the forests and the way in which it is being done, but I had supposed that the Government was doing something now with reference to reforestation. Can the gentleman advise me as to that?

Mr. LEAVITT. I would be glad to do so. In the national forests something is being done, but there is no provision at the present time for the reforestation of great areas of land which, largely before the establishing of the national forests, had by the working of our land laws passed into the hands of, first, the homesteader, and then the great private owners. They have denuded their land to a great measure. Some of these cut-over lands are valuable for agriculture, it is true, but in great measure they are of little value except for the production of timber, and meanwhile constitute the greatest of fire menaces to the great areas of virgin timber that still remain in the national forests and in private ownership. These cut-over lands often lie, as has been stated here this afternoon, among areas of valuable timberlands, which must be protected. These intervening areas must therefore be protected also, because there can be no forestry policy, no forest conservation plan of any kind, that is not based primarily on adequate fire protection.

Something has been said about the failure entirely to prevent fires in the national forests. That is impossible. I remember one time when I was a forest ranger, riding over a mountain ridge and seeing where another ranger had nailed upon a tree, which had been struck by lightning, a warning against setting fires in the woods. It was of course a joke, and I laughed at his attempt to serve a fire warning on the Creator. But the fact is that perhaps 50 or 60 per cent of the forest fires are caused by lightning. You cannot prevent their being set, but you can overcome their destructiveness very largely through an adequate system of fire protection and patrol.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEAVITT. Gladly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have not had an opportunity to examine the bill. Do I understand the gentleman that the bill provides for taking over lands privately owned for the purpose of reforestation?

Mr. LEAVITT. It provides that owners of such private lands may cede them to the Government under such provisions and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall make. That means, of course, in areas large enough so they can be administered economically.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, ordinarily I am not one of those in favor of cooperation between the Federal Government and the States. I think, perhaps, we have gone as far as we should in many details in that form of cooperation. It seems to me, however, that it is very difficult to accomplish the full desire of the people for future protection in the line that this bill provides without the assistance and cooperation of the Federal Government. Therefore I am very glad indeed to support this bill. It is of very great interest to the New England States. Of course, being the first settled sections of our country it was natural that our timberlands disappeared, perhaps, more rapidly and at an earlier date than in some other regions. I have been particularly interested in reading the testimony before the Committee on Agriculture of the representative of the Forestry Association of Massachusetts, wherein he has given very important statistics as to the need both of this legislation and the extra expense we, in New England,

are under from the necessity that now exists of securing our lumber from remote sections. It costs from \$18 to \$20 per thousand, I believe, for transportation from the Pacific coast to New England, and, so, as a practical business proposition the protection of our woodlands and reforestation of cut-over timberland is extremely desirable. It happened to be my privilege to be a member of the Massachusetts Legislature when somewhat similar legislation to this in the State was taken up, and I became greatly interested in the subject. We, in the State of Massachusetts, secured many hundreds of acres of land both by purchase on the part of the State and by donation on the part of interested citizens, and the scheme of reforestation has been a very marked success. Then, too, we have found it of very great benefit to us in the protection of the watersheds. The educational side of this reforestation question is particularly interesting also. The authorities of various cities, towns, and communities have so developed reforestation on watersheds as to increase our various water basins. Many watersheds have also been properly and scientifically cut over.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. How long has this been carried on in your State?

Mr. TREADWAY. It was about 1908 that we went into it in a broad way. The State forester was in office previously; I should say possibly five years previously to that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And you can already see the beneficial results?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; particularly where the white pine has been planted. It is a very fast grower, and I think that is the usual selection, particularly about watersheds. Of course, as to the possibility of recutting, so far as that is concerned now, that is impossible. There has not been a sufficient lapse of time. But, further than that, we have also followed the system which is also under consideration in this bill, of fire protection. The slashings that are left after the cutting off of a section of timber land are the most dangerous articles possible. They are just like a tinder box.

Mr. RAKER. I am not sure now, but it is my recollection, in reading over your Massachusetts laws, that you have some State forest land that you are protecting?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; we have a large acreage of it. I have not seen the records of the State forester for several years, but if I am given permission to extend my remarks I will be glad to insert extracts from our State forester's reports, which would give valuable information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. And I also ask unanimous consent to insert separately the extracts to which my attention was called by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] from the report of the State forester of Massachusetts and other documents.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to insert also such documents as have been described by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Would the gentleman also insert in that the law of Massachusetts as to how they handle and control that land?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes. I did not know that this bill was coming up to-day. Otherwise I would have had on hand the material to which I refer.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. If the gentleman from California will come to my office, I can show him a copy of the Massachusetts statutes on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the document mentioned. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, under leave granted to me to extend my remarks on the Clarke forestry bill and on the requests of various Members for copies of the statutes of Massachusetts, I place in the RECORD herewith letter from the State forester of Massachusetts, together with extracts from the laws of that State:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,  
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION, DIVISION OF FORESTRY,  
Statehouse, Boston, April 18, 1924.

HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your telegram just received. I am sending you under separate cover our last annual report and also our booklet of laws relative to forestry.

You will find our reforestation and purchasing acts on pages 8, 9, 10, and 11, and also our town forest law on pages 12, 13, and 14. Inserted at page 18 you will find our new law on forest taxation, which I believe is the best forest taxation law yet adopted by any State.

You will be interested to know that up to the present time 35 towns have established town forests and that at the present time our State forest acreage amounts to 72,845 acres, distributed in 35 State forests. There is a tremendous boom in forestry and we have had great difficulty in finding trees enough this year to distribute for all our various calls. Our nurseries now contain 20,000,000 trees of all ages from 1 to 4.

If I can be of any further assistance to you, please let me know immediately. \* \* \*

Very truly yours,

WM. A. L. BAZELY, Commissioner.

FOREST LAWS OF MASSACHUSETTS, INCLUDING TAXATION OF FOREST LANDS.

REFORESTATION

G. L., c. 132, § 10, as amended by c. 271, acts of 1921. The commissioner, with the advice and consent of the governor and council, for experiment and illustration in forest management and for reforestation as set forth in this section may expend annually such sum as is appropriated by the general court in purchasing lands situated within the commonwealth and adapted to forest production. Land so acquired shall be under the control and management of the forester, who may, subject to the approval of the governor and council, cut and sell trees, wood, and other produce therefrom. The price of such land shall not exceed in any instance \$5 per acre, nor shall more than 80 acres be acquired in any one tract in any one year except that a greater area may so be acquired if the land purchased directly affects a source or tributary of water supply in any town of the commonwealth. All such lands shall be conveyed to the commonwealth, and no lands shall be paid for nor shall any money be expended in improvements thereon until all instruments of conveyance and the title to be transferred thereby have been approved by the Attorney General, and until such instruments have been executed and recorded. For assisting in reforestation a portion, not exceeding 20 per cent of the money authorized to be expended under this section may be used by the forester for the distribution, at not less than cost, of seeds and seedlings to landowners who are citizens of the commonwealth, under such conditions and restrictions as the forester, subject to the approval of the governor and council, may impose. The owners of land purchased under this section, or their heirs and assigns, may repurchase the land with 10 years after the purchase, upon paying the price originally paid by the commonwealth, with interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum, together with the amount expended in improvements and maintenance. The commissioner, with the approval of the governor and council, may execute in behalf of the commonwealth such deeds of reconveyance as may be necessary, and every such deed shall contain a restriction that trees planted by the commonwealth of less than eight inches in diameter at the butt shall not be cut from such property except with the approval of the forester.

G. L., c. 132, § 5. The forester shall replant or otherwise manage all land acquired by the Commonwealth and held by it under section ten in such manner as will produce the best forest growth both as to practical forestry results and protection of water supplies.

G. L., c. 132, § 2. The commissioner of conservation, in this chapter called the commissioner, with the approval of the governor and council, may accept on behalf of the Commonwealth bequests or gifts to be used for the purpose of advancing the forestry interests of the Commonwealth, under the direction of the governor and council, in such manner as to carry out the terms of the bequests or gifts; and he may, subject to the approval of the deed and title by the attorney general as provided in section ten, accept on behalf of the Commonwealth gifts of land to be held and managed for the purpose provided in such section. A donor of such land may reserve the right to buy back the land in accordance with said section; but in the absence of a provision to that effect in his deed of gift he shall not have such right.

STATE FOREST LAW

G. L., c. 132, § 30. The commissioner may, subject to the approval of the advisory council of the department of conservation, acquire for the Commonwealth, by purchase or otherwise, and hold, any woodland or land suitable for timber cultivation within the Commonwealth, and,

with the approval of the governor and council, may take such lands in fee by eminent domain under chapter seventy-nine. The commissioner may, subject to the approval of the advisory council of the department of conservation, after a public hearing, sell or exchange any land thus acquired which in his judgment can no longer be used advantageously for such purpose. The average cost of land so purchased by the commissioner shall not exceed five dollars an acre.

G. L. c. 132, § 31. Lands acquired under the preceding section shall be known as State forests, and shall be under the control and management of the forester. He shall reforest and develop such lands, and may, subject to the approval of the commissioner and advisory council of the department of conservation, make all reasonable regulations which in his opinion will tend to increase the public enjoyment and benefit therefrom and to protect and conserve the water supplies of the Commonwealth.

G. L., c. 132, § 32. The forester, subject to the approval of the commissioner and advisory council of the department of conservation, may expend such sums as are annually appropriated for the necessary expenses incurred under section 31.

G. L., c. 132, § 33, as amended by c. 238, acts of 1921. In addition to lands acquired under section 30, the commissioner may purchase or take by eminent domain and hold for State forests lands within the Commonwealth suitable for the production of timber to the extent of not more than 100,000 acres. The land shall be purchased before August 5, 1935, at a rate not exceeding an average cost of \$5 per acre, or at such price as the general court may from time to time determine. The forester shall reclaim the said lands by replanting or otherwise in order to produce timber and to protect the water supply of the Commonwealth. The forester may employ temporarily such persons as foresters, assistant foresters, engineers, surveyors, forest fire observers, and foremen as he deems necessary to assist him in carrying out his duties under this section, and the employment of such persons shall not be subject to chapter 31.

G. L., c. 132, § 34. The commissioner may make rules and regulations relative to hunting and fishing or other uses of any such land, provided that such rules and regulations shall be consistent with all laws in relation to the protection of fish, birds, and quadrupeds.

G. L., c. 132, § 7. The forester, in the reforestation, maintenance, and development of lands purchased under sections 30 or 33 shall, so far as practicable, obtain the labor necessary therefor under sections 83 and 84 of chapter 127.

G. L., c. 132, § 36. To meet the expenditures authorized by sections 33 to 35, inclusive, the said department may expend before August 5, 1935, such sums not exceeding \$3,000,000, as the general court may from time to time appropriate.

#### TOWN FOREST LAW

G. L., c. 132, § 35. Towns may acquire by purchase, gift, or bequest lands for the purpose of forestation at a rate not exceeding an average cost of \$5 per acre and may reclaim and plant such lands. The said department may, upon application in such form as the forester may prescribe, furnish such towns free of charge with seedlings for the planting of their lands.

G. L., c. 45, § 19. A town, by a two-thirds vote at an annual town meeting, or a city, by a two-thirds vote of the city council, may determine to take or purchase land within its limits, which shall be a public domain, and may appropriate money and accept gifts of money and land therefor. Such public domain shall be devoted to the culture of forest trees or to the preservation of the water supply of such city or town, and the title thereto shall vest in the city or town in which it lies, except that cities or towns owning land within the territorial limits of other cities and towns for water-supply purposes may, as herein provided, convert such land into a public domain and retain the title thereto.

G. L., c. 45, § 20. If a city or town has determined to take land for a public domain as provided by the preceding section, the aldermen or the selectmen shall within 10 days adopt an order for the taking of such land in fee by eminent domain under chapter 79.

G. L., c. 45, § 21. The forester of each city or town, with one or more keepers appointed by him, shall have the management and charge of all its public domain. But a town, by a two-thirds vote at an annual town meeting, or a city, by a two-thirds vote of the city council, may place all such public domain under the general supervision and control of the State forester, who shall thereupon, upon notification thereof, make regulations for the care and use of such public domain and for the planting and cultivating of trees therein; and the city or town forester in such case and his keepers under the supervision and direction of the State forester, shall be charged with the duty of enforcing all such regulations and of performing such labor therein as may be necessary for the care and maintenance thereof. The city or town forester and his keepers within such public domain shall have the powers of constables and police officers.

G. L., c. 45, § 22. Any city or town owning a public domain may lease any building thereon, and it may erect thereon any building

for public instruction and recreation; provided, that if such public domain has been placed under the supervision and control of the State forester under the preceding section, no such building shall be erected unless his approval shall first be obtained. All sums derived from rents or from the sale of the products of any such domain shall be applied, so far as necessary, to the management thereof.

G. L., c. 45, § 23. No land shall be taken or purchased for a public domain, no building erected thereon and no expenditures authorized or made or liability incurred therefor until an amount sufficient to cover the estimated expense thereof has been appropriated therefor as provided in section 19, and all contracts made for expenditures in excess thereof shall be void. The expenditures shall not exceed the appropriations therefor.

G. L., c. 44, § 7. Cities and towns may incur debt, within the limit of indebtedness prescribed in section 10, for the following purposes, and payable within the periods hereinafter specified: (2) For acquiring land for public parks or public domain under chapter 45, thirty years; but no indebtedness incurred for public domain shall exceed one-half of 1 per cent of the last preceding assessed valuation of the city or town.

#### [Chapter 360]

### AN ACT PROVIDING FOR THE TAXATION OF FOREST PRODUCTS AND THE CLASSIFICATION AND TAXATION OF FOREST LANDS

Be it enacted, etc., as follows:

SECTION 1. The General Laws is hereby amended by striking out chapter 61 and inserting in place thereof the following:

#### [CHAPTER 61]

### "TAXATION OF FOREST PRODUCTS AND CLASSIFICATIONS AND TAXATIONS OF FOREST LANDS

"SECTION 1. An owner of forest land valued on the town tax list of the preceding year for land and growth at not more than \$25 per acre, and which does not contain more than 20 cords per acre on the average, but which is so stocked with trees as to promise a minimum prospective average yield per acre, exclusive of water, bog, or ledge, of 20,000 board feet for softwoods or 8,000 board feet for hardwoods, or for mixtures of the two such volume between said limits determinable by the relative percentages of the two classes of growth, may apply in writing to the town assessors to have said land listed as classified forest land, and such application shall contain a description of said land sufficiently accurate for identification. Section 2. Within 30 days after the receipt of said application the assessors shall decide whether the property fulfills the requirements for classification and shall notify the owner of their decision, giving their valuation of the tract as land alone; and if within 10 days of notification the owner accepts their decision, the assessors shall give him a certificate containing the name of the owner and a description of the parcel to be classified and stating that the land described conforms to the requirements for classification under this chapter. Upon the recording of this certificate by the owner of the registry of deeds for the county or district where the land lies, the parcel shall become classified forest land. Each parcel of land so classified shall thereafter be designated in the annual valuation list of the town, in the column provided for the description of each parcel of land, as classified forest land so long as the parcel remains so classified. The valuation and tax annually assessed upon land classified under this chapter shall not include the value of forest trees growing thereon. When classified forest land is sold or otherwise changes title the obligations and benefits of this chapter shall devolve upon the new holder of the title. Section 3. The standing growth on classified forest land shall not be taxed; but the owner of such land, except as hereinafter provided, shall pay a products tax of 6 per cent of the stumpage value upon all wood or timber cut therefrom, and one-tenth of such taxes collected by the town shall be paid to the State treasurer. Trees standing on such land shall not be included in the town valuation in apportioning the State or county tax among the towns. But an owner of classified forest land may annually cut, free of tax, wood or timber from such land, not exceeding \$25 in stumpage value: *Provided*, That such wood or timber is for his own use or for that of a tenant of said land only. Buildings or other structures standing on classified forest land shall be taxed as real estate with the land on which they stand.

"Classified forest land shall be subject to special assessments and betterment assessments. The owner shall make a sworn return to the assessors before May 1 in each year of the amount of all wood and timber cut from such land during the year ending on the preceding April 1. Section 4. When in the judgment of the assessors classified forest land contains on the average per acre 25,000 board feet for softwoods, or 10,000 board feet for hardwoods, or for mixtures of the two such volume between said limits determinable by the relative percentages of the two classes of growth,

they shall notify the owner that two years from date of notification the forest-products tax of 6 per cent of the value of the standing timber based on the above volumes will be levied and that the land and timber will at that time be taken from the classified list and placed in the general-property tax list. Should the owner elect to reduce within two years the volume of timber below the volume mentioned in the preceding sentence, the land shall remain classified; but if at the end of five years from time of cutting the growing stock on the tract does not meet the requirements for classification contained in section 1, the tract may be taken from classification by the assessors and any taxes due thereon collected. An owner may withdraw his land from classification at any time by the payment of the land tax and the forest-products tax of 6 per cent on the estimated value of the standing timber. Within 30 days after an owner requests to withdraw his land from classification the assessors shall determine the taxes due thereon, which shall be paid before the land is taken from the classified list. When in the judgment of the assessors classified forest land becomes more valuable for other use than the production of trees they may, after 30 days' notice, withdraw said land from classification, and any taxes due thereon shall be paid at the time of withdrawal: *Provided*, That the owner may appeal from such withdrawal to the commissioner, whose decision shall be final. Whenever land is withdrawn from classification the assessors shall record in the registry of deeds for the county or district where the land lies a certificate setting forth such withdrawal and containing reference by book and page to the record of the certificate under which said land was classified. Section 5. In case of dispute as to the eligibility of land for classification or as to the volume of wood or timber contained on such land or cut therefrom either party may appeal to the State forester, who shall examine the property and hear both parties and whose decision shall be final. Section 6. Any owner of classified forest land who fails to comply with the requirements of this chapter shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$10 nor more than \$500, and in addition to said penalty the land may be withdrawn from classification by the assessors.

"Sec. 2. Notwithstanding the passage of this act, all land and the trees, wood, and timber thereon which are, on the date when this act takes effect, subject to the provisions of chapter 61 of the General Laws shall continue to be subject thereto in accordance therewith. (Approved May 2, 1922.)"

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on certain features of the pending revenue bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on certain features of the pending revenue bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, an important but not generally well understood feature of the House revenue bill is the increase in inheritance taxes and a provision for the deduction from the amount assessed by the Federal Government of any inheritance tax paid to the several States.

It has long been the opinion of our best economists that heavier inheritance taxes should be levied upon the great estates by the Federal Government, and this view has been supported by such prominent business men as Andrew Carnegie and others, and equally prominent statesmen, such as Theodore Roosevelt. In the past, however, the influences of those wishing to preserve these enormous aggregations of wealth, which both in amount and number far exceed those of any other country, have prevented any such legislation being adopted. There was also the practical argument against raising the Federal inheritance taxes on the great estates that it interfered with these estates becoming a source of revenue to the States wherein the owner resided. On the other hand, the States were hampered in taxing these estates themselves because the owners had only to take up a residence in some other State that did not impose any inheritance taxes in order that their estates might escape the inheritance tax, and by this action the State also lost the personal-property tax which it might have received during their lifetime.

There has been much misrepresentation of the provisions of the House revenue bill, and, among other things, it has been stated that this provision doubled the present inheritance taxes. This is not true. In the present law the tax begins at 1 per cent on the amount above \$50,000 and is graded up to 40 per cent on \$10,000,000 or over, the rate remaining the same on all estates up to \$100,000. It should be borne in mind that the amount on which the tax is imposed is not the whole estate, as \$50,000 is entirely exempt from such taxation. There is in the bill the further important provision that any inheritance tax paid to any State or States can be deducted

from the amount of the Federal tax. This will have the effect of making the tax exactly the same, no matter in what State the original owner of the estate resided.

Nearly all of the great writers on social subjects agree that the immense estates which exist in this country are a menace to the future of our Government and institutions by reason of the concentration of power in the hands of a few, and everyone who has made a study of the subject recognizes that the more widely wealth is distributed the more secure is law and order. The history of the past has shown that nothing has contributed so much to the downfall of governments as extreme wealth on the one hand and extreme poverty on the other, for the two naturally go together. Prominent economists also agree that taxation upon inheritances is subject to less objection than any other, for the reason that such taxation does not operate to check initiative or endeavor and the person upon whom it falls receives the inheritance without any effort upon his part. Unlike other kinds of taxation, it is almost impossible to evade.

A statement has been given out by the Treasury to the effect that under the House bill a large estate would be sacrificed by a forced sale of assets to pay the tax, but the House bill allowed six years for the payment of the tax, from which it will be seen that there is nothing in this contention. The tax is no higher than that of England; in fact, not as high on the small estates, because only \$500 is exempted, instead of \$50,000 as in our law, but the exemption from the Federal tax should be larger, because of the inheritance taxes in some States which do not make any exemptions.

This increase in the Federal inheritance taxes on the great estates will not in the least interfere with the several States obtaining revenues from the same source. On the contrary, it actually assists the States, because it becomes impossible to escape taxation by a change of residence, for the tax on the estate will be the same, no matter where the decedent who owned it resided.

The House revenue bill, so far as the provisions of it relating to income taxes are concerned, will produce as much or more than the so-called Mellon bill. The tables attached to the revenue bill as reported by the Senate are in effect an admission that the original estimate of the Treasury with reference to the loss of revenue resulting from the Mellon plan was \$100,000,000 in error, as I stated at the time. The table attached to Secretary Mellon's letter of November 10, 1923, written to me shows that the loss on the surtaxes would be only \$101,000,000. I had heretofore given out a statement that the loss on the surtaxes under the Mellon plan would be about twice that amount. The report of the Senate committee on the Senate bill, page 3, which used the Mellon rates, now admits the error by showing correctly that the loss on the surtaxes is \$200,000,000.

The maximum surtaxes might well be placed at 35 per cent instead of 37½ per cent, as in the House bill. Whether the rate be placed at 35 per cent or 25 per cent will make little difference so far as investments in tax-exempt securities are concerned. It will still be advantageous for many wealthy men to invest in tax-exempt securities at whichever rate is adopted, and it will still be possible for them to escape a considerable portion of the surtaxes by reason of having their investments in corporations which only distribute a part of the profits made.

The statement given out by the Treasury with reference to the decline in revenue received from those having large incomes is very misleading. The table begins with 1916, when war profits were at their height, for during the war it was not remarkable for a million dollars to be made in a few months. There never was and probably never will be again a time when profits were so high. There was a continual falling off, very naturally, in the number of such individuals until the year 1921, which is the last year given in the table. Since then the number of large incomes reported has been nearly stationary. It is claimed that the reduction to 25 per cent should be made to lessen the investment in tax-exempt securities, and the astonishing claim is that the Government will get more revenue at this lower rate. The absurdity of this proposition can be seen at a glance, when we realize that there will always be the same amount of tax-exempt securities in circulation, and the same amount of money withdrawn from active business and invested in them, and that consequently any shifting of investments in this line would make but little, if any, difference in the Government revenues. In this connection another point ought to be noticed. It is universally admitted that tax-exempt securities are bought by the extremely wealthy and others for the purpose of avoiding the income taxes, and that they are willing to pay a higher price for them than they would for taxable securities or to accept a lower rate of interest. But if

the income taxes are passed on there would be no object in buying tax-exempt securities instead of any other bonds which were equally well secured. This is another place where the claim that income taxes are passed on will not stand argument.

The gift taxes imposed by the House bill are a corollary to the inheritance taxes and are based on the same rates, with an exemption of \$50,000. It is idle to impose high inheritance taxes upon estates and permit the owner thereof to escape them by making a pretense of dividing his estate among his near relatives during his lifetime. There is a double incentive to do this, as the owner of the estate thereby decreases the amount of the surtaxes upon the aggregate of the estate, and the Government has lost more by such divisions and the creation of revocable trusts and other devices intended to evade taxes than it has by tax-exempt securities. While the gift tax would not bring in much revenue directly, it indirectly would largely increase the revenues. The claim that it would accomplish nothing is mere pretense, as has been shown by the vigor and persistence with which the tax has been fought.

The new rates for inheritance taxes, with the provision that the State inheritance taxes should be credited on the amount assessed by the Federal Government, and the gift taxes present a much-needed reform in our tax system. The forces of reaction may block progress in this direction for a time, but in the end the change is certain to be made, and it is to be hoped that the new revenue bill as finally enacted will retain these important features of the House bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That if the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that the system and practice of forest-fire prevention and suppression provided by any State substantially promotes the objects described in the foregoing section, he is hereby authorized and directed, under such conditions as he may determine to be fair and equitable in each State, to cooperate with appropriate officials of each State, and through them with private and other agencies therein, in the protection of timbered and forest-producing lands from fire. In no case other than for preliminary investigations shall the amount expended by the Federal Government in any State during any fiscal year, under this section, exceed the amount expended by the State for the same purpose during the same fiscal year, including the expenditures of forest owners or operators which are required by State law or which are made in pursuance of the forest-protection system of the State under State supervision and for which in all cases the State renders satisfactory accounting. In the cooperation extended to the several States due consideration shall be given to the protection of watersheds of navigable streams, but such cooperation may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be extended to any timbered or forest-producing lands within the cooperating States.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a new section, to be numbered "section 21."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Add as a new section the following:

"SEC. 21. That when used in this act, unless the context indicates otherwise, the term 'lands of the United States' means lands set apart, reserved, or withdrawn under the provisions of section 24 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1891, entitled 'An act to repeal timber culture laws, and for other purposes,' and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto.

"The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 2. That the United States Government hereby assumes, subject to the conditions of this act or any subsequent act of Congress, the payment to the several States of sums of money equivalent to the amounts which such States would receive from the taxation of said lands of the United States within their respective borders if such lands were owned by individuals."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the reading has gone far enough to show that the amendment is subject to a point of order. I make a point of order on it.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask if this is a substitute for the present bill, or what is it?

Mr. RAKER. It is simply a new section to carry out the cooperation between the States and the Federal Government.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not germane to the section which it succeeds.

Mr. TINCHER. And it transfers jurisdiction from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not germane. It is certainly subject to a point of order as far as it has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair the reading has not proceeded far enough yet to determine whether it is subject to a point of order or not. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the amendment, as follows:

SEC. 3. That the Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the passage of this act and annually thereafter, at such time of the year as the legislature of the State may designate, send a statement to the governor, or such other officer as the legislature may designate, of every State in which such lands are located, describing the location, size, and character of all lands of the United States within the border of such State, together with such information respecting such lands as he may possess which may be useful in properly determining their value.

SEC. 4. That no payments shall be made to any State under the provisions of this act until such State has, with respect to the lands of the United States in question, acting through its officers and agents duly authorized therefor—

(1) Properly assessed such lands of the United States at a rate no higher than that at which other similar lands within such State are assessed.

(2) Applied to such assessed valuation a factor no higher than the tax rate applied to the assessed value of other similar lands within such State—

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order. The pending bill has reference to the control of forest lands entirely by the Department of Agriculture. The proposed amendment has in view their control entirely by the Secretary of the Interior. I submit that at this time in the afternoon we ought not to be obliged to sit here and witness the idle performance of reading an intricate bill as an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from California whether, as a matter of fact, it does not introduce a new element of taxation with respect to Federal lands.

Mr. RAKER. No; it is not taxing Federal land. I would like to be heard on the point of order. I have not had the time to change "Secretary of the Interior" to "Secretary of Agriculture," but I will ask unanimous consent to do that before we get through.

I want to call the Chair's attention specifically—

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order—

Mr. RAKER. The Chair gave me the right to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. But I am going to make another point of order which takes precedence—that we have no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. RAKER. Will not the gentleman from Texas withhold his point of order so that this may be printed in the Record?

Mr. BLANTON. I suggest that the gentleman from California ask unanimous consent to have his amendment printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas withhold his point of order for that purpose?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I withhold it for the present.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment may be printed without further reading.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is pending.

Mr. BLANTON. The point of order is withheld.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent, with the point of order pending, that the balance of the amendment may be printed in the Record without further reading.

Mr. TINCHER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is pending.

Mr. BLANTON. I renew the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas renews his point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4830 and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SEGER, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. MONTAGUE, for two days, to fill a public engagement.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMPERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the RECORD on the rent legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the same request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAMPERT], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL] ask unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the rent legislation. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

## THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RENT COMMISSION.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the bill for the continuation of the District of Columbia Rent Commission came before this House for consideration. I at that time opposed the bill, because it gave as the excuse for the continuation of the Rent Commission the existence at the present time of a war emergency, on the basis of which the Rent Commission was created during the recent war. No war emergency exists at the present time, and no legislation can properly be asked for at the present time on the theory that any war emergency still exists.

One of the greatest needs at the present time is entire demobilization of the necessarily autocratic powers exercised by the Federal Government in the extraordinary emergency of the late war. The attitude of mind still exists, however, in Congress on many matters that the Federal Government should continue to exercise war powers.

I actively opposed the passage of the bill providing for the continuation of the District of Columbia Rent Commission with its extraordinary powers for the regulation of rents, there being no more reason at the present time, in my judgment, that rents should be regulated by the Federal Government in the District of Columbia than that the price of eggs, the price of beef, the price of butter, or the price of any other necessity of life should be so regulated.

The Rent Commission has not prevented increases in rents and has contributed to restriction in the normal progress of development of rental properties in Washington. I have received a letter from one of the most experienced real-estate men in the District of Columbia, a man of the highest possible standing, who was familiar with real-estate conditions in the District for a number of years before the war, and who is familiar with conditions to-day. I understand that in a few days another attempt will be made to pass the legislation providing for a continuation of the Rent Commission. I therefore desire the membership of the House to have the benefit of the views of Mr. Randall H. Hagner, as expressed to me in the following letter of April 16:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 16, 1924.

Hon. JOHN PHILIP HILL,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HILL: I was very glad to see that you have taken an active interest in opposing the continuation of the rent bill. As you know, this legislation was first enacted as a war emergency measure, and in many ways as such it served its purpose. The war is long since over. In my opinion, further continuation is most dangerous and un-American legislation not only as far as the District of Columbia is concerned, but dangerous in establishing a precedent which the States comprising the country may follow. It is inconceivable to me that any intelligent person could regard the continuation of legislation such as this as a usable substitute to improve upon an economic law, namely, the law of supply and demand. The only effect that this law has had upon the housing situation in Washington has been to drive most of the capital into improving properties not under the control of the Rent Commission. This has resulted in a serious shortage of available residential rental properties and an overabundance of properties for purchase and, incidentally, an equal surplus of available business properties.

Were the Rent Commission to go out of existence when the present act expires there would immediately be available for rental a large number of dwellings, which have heretofore been withheld from the rental market, solely because, under the rent act, a rental contract between an owner and tenant no longer means anything. There are to-day hundreds of vacant apartments in Washington—in fact, I dare say, that there are as many buildings with vacant apartments in them as there are buildings totally or completely rented. In addition there are a great number of apartments now under construction.

I noticed in the newspapers a short time ago a statement to the effect that there were some eleven or twelve hundred houses offered for sale in Washington. This statement is not only misleading, but is absolutely incorrect. There are thousands of houses in Washington offered for sale. The only shortage that exists to-day in the housing situation is the very one which the rent legislation itself has caused;

namely, the scarcity of individual houses offered for rental. An unbiased survey to-day will show that there are actually hundreds of new houses on the market for sale—which houses are held for sale and not offered for rent merely because under the rent law a contract entered into by an owner of a house with a tenant may be changed by the Rent Commission to such a point that the owner's net return on his investment would be not only jeopardized, but possibly totally eliminated.

Anyone who is willing to look at the house situation in Washington from an unbiased viewpoint, will concede the fact that Washington is rapidly being overbuilt in houses for sale, but it is greatly underbuilt in houses for rent. This condition is the very one which the rent law makes possible. With the continuation of the rent law no owner is going to enter into a rental agreement with a tenant when there is a representative tenant body standing ready to nullify that agreement and hand down an opinion regulating the rental and condition under which the house may be held by a tenant. It is now possible under the present law for a tenant the day after signing a lease to go to the Rent Commission and have the lease set aside, and they decide on what basis the tenant may continue to occupy the house. No intelligent person is going to invest money in real estate under such conditions. It is impossible, however, for an owner to appeal to the Rent Commission to have any change whatsoever made in the terms of the agreement he has entered into.

As I understand it, under the Ball rent act, neither a landowner nor a real-estate broker may hold office on the Rent Commission. In other words, this body must be entirely composed of people who are tenants; consequently how can any owner of rental real estate expect to get an unbiased decision from a body having only a tenant's viewpoint? Before the war there were numbers of houses offered for rental, due to the fact that the average builder of houses would rent them at a fair rental and dispose of them to investors. This form of the real-estate business has totally disappeared solely and absolutely for the above reason.

In addition to the above, the rent law makes it totally impossible for an owner of rental residential real estate to dispose of it with the promise of possession to the new owner. I shall try to demonstrate this point. If I own a house and Jones live in it, and you want to buy it, and the lease has a clause providing that Jones vacate in the event of a sale, I, as owner, can not dispossess Jones because I do not intend to use the house for my own occupancy. The result is that you have got to buy the house and literally buy a lawsuit in addition in order to get the tenant out. The only way this can be done is for you, as the purchaser, to pay for the house and become the title owner, and then enter a claim that you need the house for your own occupancy. This is only possible after you have actually taken title to the property and paid me for it, and very often several months elapse before you can get possession of the property. You can readily see that the average prospective purchaser does not wish to get into this sort of a lawsuit in order to buy a place to live, and that is the reason why houses offered for sale will not be rented.

To my mind, no condition could be more impractical, unfair, or detrimental to law in general than legislation which makes such a situation necessary.

Two years ago business properties were taken from under the control of the Rent Commission. As a result, to-day there are hundreds of available business locations. In other words, most of the capital invested in residential investment real estate has been diverted to business property, solely because an owner of residential real estate has no voice in the return he might receive.

My interest in the elimination of the continuation of this law is solely for the purpose of reestablishing the faith of the investing public in Washington real estate. As long as the ownership of real estate is regulated by a body of persons more or less representing the tenants, investors hesitate to buy realty holdings if a lawsuit is to be the result.

To my mind the rent law as it stands to-day is discriminatory, confiscatory, and totally un-American. It violates every principal of property rights as set forth in the Constitution. Except as a war emergency measure it has no justification. The war is long since over, and somewhat similar rent laws have been declared unconstitutional by the courts of Missouri and California. There is no Representative or Senator in Congress to-day whose constituents would tolerate legislation of this sort in their communities. Consequently, it seems to me that as Washington is, you might say, the ward of Congress, we who live here deserve from Congress the same treatment that their constituents would get were some one attempting to inflict legislation of this kind on those constituents.

With kind regards,

Yours very sincerely,

RANDALL H. HAGNER.

There is no one in this House who more actively desires fairness on the rent question than I do, or who is more actively interested in protecting the person of moderate means who desires to rent a dwelling house or an apartment.

The Rent Commission, however, does not offer, under existing circumstances, a proper remedy for any abuses which may have

occurred in charges for such dwellings and apartments. I therefore hope that this House will not continue a commission, the only excuse for the continuation of which is alleged in the first paragraph of the proposed bill to be an indefinite continuance of the war emergency

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House, in accordance with the order previously made, adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 17, 1924, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LANGLEY: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. S. 1918. An act relative to officers in charge of public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 516). Referred to the House Calendar.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8170) granting an increase of pension to Norma McEnhill; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8212) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Wright; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 8707) to authorize taxation of the interests of entrymen on Federal irrigation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 8708) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8709) to authorize the payment of claims under the provisions of the so-called war minerals relief act; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8710) to amend section 4874 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, providing for the selection of superintendents of national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 8711) to authorize the consolidation and coordination of Government purchases, to enlarge the functions of the General Supply Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 8712) to further regulate interstate commerce and the Post Office Department, and to prescribe penalties for violating such regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 245) to create a commission to secure plans and designs for and to erect a monument or memorial building in the city of Washington to the memory of the negro soldiers and sailors who fought in the wars of our country and the late World War; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York favoring the construction of a bridge across Lake Champlain connecting the States of New York and Vermont; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 8713) granting a pension to Mary McGinn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 8714) granting a pension to Jane F. Cochrane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLATFELTER: A bill (H. R. 8715) granting a pension to Elmer J. Hartman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 8716) granting an increase of pension to Michael Quinn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 8717) granting an increase of pension to Nancy W. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8718) granting a pension to Jerusha G. Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8719) granting a pension to Orpha H. Lawton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 8720) for the relief of Richard E. Sands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOST: A bill (H. R. 8721) granting a pension to Leo Edmund Owings; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8722) granting an increase of pension to John R. Tapp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8723) granting an increase of pension to Clatness V. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 8724) granting a pension to Julia F. Gannon Veats; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 8725) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Fetterman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 8726) granting a pension to Julie Cowan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 8727) for the relief of Roger Sherman Hoar; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8728) granting a pension to Isaac T. Osler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 8729) granting an increase of pension to Mary Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8730) for the relief of the Kanawha Valley Coal Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8731) for the relief of Robert F. Foote; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2428. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of the San Luis Obispo County (Calif.) Farm Bureau Grain Exchange, indorsing the McNary-Haugen bill (H. R. 5563); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2429. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of Wm. F. Scannell Chapter, No. 6, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, of Liberty, N. Y., urging the immediate enactment of pending legislation in behalf of the disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2430. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of the New England Nurserymen's Association, expressing approval of a national botanic garden and arboretum on the Mount Hamilton site by the Anacostia River; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

2431. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Hatchard, 93 Alexander Street, Dorchester, Mass., recommending favorable consideration of the Dill radio bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2432. By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Fall River, Mass., against the legalization of beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2433. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of citizens of the county of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, asking favorable action on Senate bill 2600, aimed to give freedom to radio broadcasting; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2434. By Mr. KINDRED: Petition of New York Produce Exchange, opposing the reinsertion of the tax on telephone and telegraph communication in the proposed revision of the revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2435. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Meyer, Lyra & Co. (Inc.), general exporters, New York, N. Y., that in the interests of the export trade, pressure will be brought to bear in favor of bill introduced by Representative W. R. Newton, leaving application of the act to the discretion of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2436. Also, petition of C. J. Marion, Federal Building, Oswego, N. Y., asking that Senate bill 1718 be passed, as of great benefit to all employees in the Steamboat Inspection Service; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2437. Also, petition of Mrs. Jacob D. Posner, "Dr. A. Posner, Shoes (Inc.)," that the shoe tag bill be defeated once and for all; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2438. Also, petition of American Shoe Workers' Protective Union (Inc.), 132 Cumberland Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the provisions of Senate bill 794 in connection with plan to manufacture shoes, etc., at Leavenworth prison, and urging opposition to this legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2439. Also (by request), petition of the MacSwiney-Fitzgerald Council of the American Association for Recognition of the Irish Republic, who appeal for the immediate release of the Hon. Eamon de Valera; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2440. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, requesting that the proper development of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce, be permitted by providing the funds necessary for the adequate support of this important work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2441. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition of St. Paul Council of the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, urging support of House Resolution 208 and House bill 1552; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2442. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging support of the Reed-Sterling educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

2443. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging support of drastic restriction of immigration and that quota of 1890 be used as a basis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2444. By Mr. YOUNG: Petitions of North Dakota Farm Bureau Federation, of Flasher, N. Dak., and Niagara-Shawnee Agricultural Club, of Niagara, N. Dak., urging the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, April 17, 1924

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 10, 1924)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7111) to promote American agriculture by making more extensively available and by expanding the service now rendered by the Department of Agriculture in gathering and disseminating information regarding agricultural production, competition, and demand in foreign countries, in promoting the sale of farm products abroad, and in other ways, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The principal clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ernst	Keyes	Shields
Ball	Fernald	King	Simmons
Bayard	Ferris	Ladd	Smith
Borah	Fess	Lodge	Smoot
Brandegee	Fletcher	McCormick	Spencer
Brookhart	Frazier	McKellar	Stanfield
Broussard	George	McKinley	Stephens
Bruce	Gerry	McLean	Sterling
Bursum	Glass	McNary	Swanson
Cameron	Gooding	Mayfield	Trammell
Capper	Hale	Neely	Underwood
Caraway	Harrell	Norris	Wadsworth
Colt	Harris	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Harrison	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Cummins	Heflin	Pepper	Warren
Curtis	Howell	Phipps	Weller
Dale	Johnson, Minn.	Ralston	Willis
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Reed, Pa.	
Edwards	Jones, Wash.	Robinson	
Elkins	Kendrick	Sheppard	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is absent on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is absent owing to illness in his family. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

### ADMINISTRATION OF VETERANS' BUREAU IN ARIZONA

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have a letter from Gen. Frank T. Hines, Director of the Veterans' Bureau, in which he transmits for my consideration a communication addressed to me by Maj. Louis T. Grant, under date of April 3, 1924, concerning a letter from the Hon. George W. P. Hunt, Governor of Arizona, which was printed in the RECORD. Inasmuch as the letter of Governor Hunt appeared in the RECORD, I ask that the letter of Major Grant be also printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU.

San Francisco, Calif., April 3, 1924.

Hon. REED SMOOT,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMOOT: My attention has been called to a letter appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 4704, from Governor Hunt, of Arizona, addressed to Senator CAMERON, of Arizona. There is one portion of this letter I wish to call to your attention, because it intimates that an insufficient amount of money is being allowed for telegraphic service in the subdistrict of the United States Veterans' Bureau located in Phoenix, Ariz.

I feel that in the administration of veteran relief every resource of the Government should be utilized as far as directed by law for the benefit of the disabled veteran, but also every business precaution should be taken to see that no unnecessary expense is incurred. Following this belief, in this district a very careful budget system has been established, in which telegrams and other expenses are carefully estimated for each quarter in advance. The total allowance made by central office for the current quarter, January to April, in this district, which comprises the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada, was \$375. The basis of allotment is upon the number of pieces of mail sent from each subdistrict office. On this basis Phoenix, sending out 3,260 pieces of mail for the month of February, may be taken as a standard with a weight of 1. Carrying out this same method, the various other offices in the district would total up 24½, making a 25½ total. If the apportionment for the Phoenix office had been solely on that basis, it would have received about \$15 for the quarter, but there were some other elements entering into the case which made the total allotment for the telegrams for the quarter \$33.75. The fact is that at the termination of the third quarter, March 31, 1924, the Phoenix office had an unexpended balance of \$11.33, which indicates that the sum allotted was ample and that there has been no failure on the part of the bureau to afford all necessary relief to veterans because of any curtailment of funds, as the letter from Governor Hunt would seem to indicate.

I address this letter to you as chairman of the Finance Committee in order that the Senate may understand both sides of the question and not gather an impression that there exists any failure to carry out the various acts for veteran relief. The wording of Governor Hunt's letter, in which the expression "The subdistrict office is allowed only 20 cents a day for telegrams," might be construed as a curtailment of necessary use of the telegraph, but, as above shown, such is not the fact. Not only have sufficient funds been allowed, but there was an unexpended balance at the end of the quarter.

Very truly yours,

LOUIS T. GRANT,  
District Manager.

### SALARIES IN THE UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report submitted by the United States Veterans' Bureau, showing, by location, salary range, and bureau designation, employees receiving an aggregate annual salary of \$2,000 and over, as of April 1, 1924, for the central office, and as of March 1, 1924, for the field, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., praying for the passage of a drastically restrictive immigration law, with 2 per cent quotas based on the 1890 census, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a letter, in the nature of a petition, jointly signed by V. H. Harrison, general chairman of the Association of Metal Craft Employees, and D. W. Boyce, general chairman of the Association of Car Department Employees, both of the St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co., at Pine Bluff, Ark., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Howell-Barkley railway labor bill, or if that bill is passed to be so amended as to protect the rights of their organizations, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LADD presented a petition of sundry citizens of Norwich, N. Dak., praying for the passage of the so-called Johnson re-